XAVIER
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

GEO. A. FLOYD CO.
LIBRARY
MAY 8 1970
BINDERS
CINCINNATI, O.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

https://archive.org/details/woodstockletters9811unse

A. M. D. G.

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

VOLUME 98

1 9 6 9

WOODSTOCK COLLEGE
Woodstock, Maryland

FOR JESUIT USE

INDEX TO VOLUME 98

Buffalo Mission: 1869–1969, The. 465

Changing Patterns in the Jesuit organization. Vivian Tellis-Nayak 71

Community in Relation to the Apostolate, The. Norbert J. Rigali 33

Community Life, On. Frederic M. O'Connor 381

Discernment as a Political Problem. Michael Sheeran 446

Double "Principle and Foundation" in the Spiritual Exercises, The. Joseph A. Bracken 319

Early Approach to Understanding Indian Religiousness, An. Patrick J. Ryan 393

Forty Years After. Lowrie J. Daly 354

Jesuit Community as a Community of Service, The. Felix F. Cardegna 53

Jesuits under the Czars, The. Denis Dirscherl 435

New Poems by Berrigan. Edward V. DeSantis 363

Night in Resurrection City, A. Horace B. McKenna 238

Place of Community in Jesuit Life, The. William W. Meissner .. 96

Psychological Dimensions of the "Jesuit Family." Joseph J. Papaj 87

Report of the Special Committee on Fordham University ... 242

Report of the New England Province Commission on Gerontology and New Ministries 299

Report of the Special Committee on Secondary Education (New York Province) 252

Report on Mid-Career Planning Workshop, 1968 307

Report on the Problem of the Disaffection of Young Jesuits for Our Current Educational Apostolate. JEA Special Committee, 1967 113

Schools, Jesuits and Disaffection. Robert D. Coursey 120

Simon Fouche, s.j. Sr. Lilliana Owens, S.L. 425

Superior's Role Within Obedience, The. Mark R. Voss 409

Theology and Literature, Selected Readings in Methodology. Patrick Samway 130
31st General Congregation, the: Letters from the Second Session. James P. Jurich (ed.) 5
Wartime Superior in the Philippines. John F. Hurley 149
What 1600 Priests Think of Pre-Retirement and Retirement. John D. Zuercher 277

CONTRIBUTORS

Bracken, Joseph A. The Double "Principle and Foundation" in the Spiritual Exercises 319
Cardegna, Felix F. The Jesuit Community as a Community of Service 53
Coursey, Robert D. Schools, Jesuits and Disaffection 120
Daly, Lowrie J. Forty Years After 354
DeSantis, Edward V. New Poems by Berrigan 363
Dirscherl, Denis. The Jesuits under the Czars. 435
Hurley, John F. Wartime Superior in the Philippines 149
Jurich, James P. (ed.). The 31st General Congregation: Letters from the Second Session 5
McKenna, Horace B. A Night in Resurrection City 238
Meissner, William W. The Place of Community in Jesuit Life ... 96
O'Connor, Frederic M. On Community Life 381
Owens, S.L., Sr. Lilliana. Simon Fouche, S.J. 425
Papaj, Joseph J. Psychological Dimensions of the "Jesuit Family" .. 87
Rigali, Norbert J. The Community in Relation to the Apostolate .. 33
Ryan, Patrick J. An Early Approach to Understanding Indian Religiousness 393
Samway, Patrick. Theology and Literature: Selected Readings in Methodology 130
Sheeran, Michael. Discernment as a Political Problem 446
Tellis-Nayak, Vivian. Changing Patterns in the Jesuit Organization 71
Voss, Mark R. The Superior's Role Within Obedience 409
Zuercher, John D. What 1600 Priests Think of Pre-Retirement and Retirement 277

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

WINTER 1969

VOLUME 98 NUMBER 1

Introduction

Provincial and interprovincial conferences around the country suggest that the Jesuit community—its meaning, necessity, shape and size—is still an issue for debate. WOODSTOCK LETTERS presents five papers on the subject. Two, by Frs. Rigali and Cardegna, were originally delivered at meetings on Jesuit renewal. The other three, by Frs. Tellis-Nayak, Meissner, and Mr. Papaj were written for this quarterly. While the papers take widely divergent approaches, they all agree on the need for theoretical or practical change and for continued open-mindedness.

Fr. Jurich, formerly an associate editor of WOODSTOCK LETTERS, has edited selections from the *Lettres de Rome* to the province of Montreal. They deal with the second session of the 31st General Congregation. The letters from the first session appeared in volume 96 (1967) of this quarterly. In this issue we also offer a study sponsored by the JEA on the disaffection of younger Jesuits for our current educational apostolate. Fr. Montague, the chairman of the composing committee, stresses the context of the report (cf. *Report . . .*, "Location of the Problem"). It is an exploratory work, and admits that work still must be done on the basic phenomenon as well as its causes and possible results. Mr. Coursey comments on the report in the succeeding article.

Finally, Mr. Samway, a former managing editor of WOODSTOCK LETTERS, offers a review of readings in Theology and Literature, stimulated not only by his own research, but also by his attendance at national seminars on the subject.

G. C. R.

WINTER, 1969

CONTENTS

5 THE 31ST GENERAL CONGREGATION: LETTERS FROM THE SECOND SESSION • *Edited by James P. Jurich, S.J.*

A SYMPOSIUM ON JESUIT COMMUNITY

33 The Community in Relation to the Apostolate • *Norbert J. Rigali, S.J.*

53 The Jesuit Community as a Community of Service • *Felix F. Cardegna, S.J.*

71 Changing Patterns in the Jesuit Organization • *Vivian Tellis-Nayak, S.J.*

87 Psychological Dimensions of the "Jesuit Family" • *Joseph J. Papaj, S.J.*

96 The Place of Community in Jesuit Life • *William W. Meissner, S.J.*

ON DISAFFECTION

113 I A Report on the Problem of the Disaffection of Young Jesuits for Our Current Educational Apostolate • *JEA Special Committee, 1967*

120 II Schools, Jesuits and Disaffection • *Robert D. Coursey, S.J.*

SELECTED READINGS

130 Theology and Literature: Selected Readings in Methodology • *Patrick Samway, S.J.*

FOR CONTRIBUTORS

WOODSTOCK LETTERS solicits manuscripts from all Jesuits on all topics of particular interest to fellow Jesuits: Ignatian spirituality, the activities of our various apostolates, problems facing the modern Society, and the history of the Society, particularly in the United States and its missions. In general it is our policy to publish major obituary articles on men whose work would be of interest to the whole assistancy.

Letters of comment and criticism will be welcomed for the Readers' Forum.

Manuscripts, preferably the original copy, should be double-spaced with ample margins. Whenever possible, contributors of articles on Ignatian spirituality and Jesuit history should follow the stylistic norms of the Institute of Jesuit Sources. These are most conveniently found in Supplementary Notes B and C and in the list of abbreviations in Joseph de Guibert, S.J., *The Jesuits: Their Spiritual Doctrine and Practice*, trans. W. J. Young (Chicago, 1964), pp. 609–16.

STAFF

Published by the students of Woodstock College. *Editor*: Edward J. Mally, S.J. / *Managing Editor*: Gerard C. Reedy, S.J. / *Copy Editor*: Richard R. Galligan, S.J. / *Associate Editors*: Richard A. Blake, S.J., J. Peter Conroy, S.J., James F. Donnelly, S.J., Paul L. Horgan, S.J., Joseph J. Papaj, S.J., Joseph F. Roccasalvo, S.J., Patrick H. Samway, S.J., Thomas H. Stahel, S.J. / *Business Manager*: Alfred E. Caruana, S.J.

THE 31ST GENERAL CONGREGATION: LETTERS FROM THE SECOND SESSION

Edited by James P. Jurich, S.J.

In 1967 WOODSTOCK LETTERS *presented "The 31st General Congregation: Letters from the First Session," an article in two parts.*[1] *A translation of nine* Lettres de Rome *prepared and distributed by the Provincial's office of the Province of Montreal, this article offered a more personal account of the events of the Congregation than the official* Newsletters *could provide.*

As it had promised at the end of the first session, the Province of Montreal continued its Lettres de Rome *service during the second session, producing twice as much printed material in the process. Large portions of this material summarized the valuable work done throughout the Society in preparation for the second session. This included reports and position papers written by experts as well as preliminary drafts of decrees drawn up by the members of the Congregation. We also find personalized accounts of the discussions and debates during the sessions and of the day-to-day circumstances surrounding them. It is from this rich historical source that* WOODSTOCK LETTERS *now present the following article.*

The 31st General Congregation is already part of history, but it continues to exert a profound influence on the Society of Jesus. Efforts to implement the decrees in various parts of the Society have already served to show how much more the thinking on the realities of our religious life can and must develop. The Congregation itself often looked forward to its successor only a few years ahead, and many Jesuits hope that ideas prematurely expressed during the 31st General Congregation will reach their maturity in the 32nd. The editors hope, therefore, that the publication of "Letters from the Second Session" will serve more than a merely historical interest, for those who will have a part to play

---

Translated by James P. Jurich and Robert C. Collins.

[1] 96 (1967) 5-34, 143-95.

in the next Congregation—and that should mean all Jesuits—will have to grapple with and build upon many of the unresolved discussions of the 31st General Congregation.

Limitations of space and local interest require that not all of the original French text be translated here. In addition, a few short sections have been replaced by the corresponding treatment of the same events in the English-language Newsletters *written by Fr. Donald Campion, who at the time of writing sometimes had the advantage of more complete documentary sources. ..*

Thanks are due to Fr. Irénée Desrochers, S.J., who, as Provincial of Montreal, gave permission to publish this translation, to Montreal's "envoyé spécial" at the Congregation, the principal author of these accounts, and to the members of the Provinces of Maryland, Montreal, and New York who encouraged the editors in this translation project.

September 4, 1966

Return to Rome

I arrived at the Curia after a fine, uneventful trip . . . .

They warned us that it was hot in Rome. As a matter of fact, I was carrying two pieces of luggage, one of which contained my typewriter, and I was wearing a coat. I found the heat overwhelming, but actually it was 80°. I arrived at the Curia at 2 P.M. sweating all over. I took a shower, said Mass, and went for a walk in St. Peter's Square . . . .

Plastic surgery

I returned to the Curia for an inspection tour of the house. In the large chapel downstairs they had completely removed the main altar and transferred the Blessed Sacrament to the small altar on the right. In the sanctuary there is now only a large, completely bare table of white marble. Along the wall in the back they set up a very small altar used only for benediction. The situation has remained the same in the domestic chapel, except that they have found a solution (an excellent one, I think) to the concelebration problem. The altar is still in the back, but every morning they place a small portable table approximately four feet long two or three feet in front of the altar steps, and on this table they say concelebrated Masses facing the people.

But the recreation room is the one that has undergone the greatest transformation. At one and the same time it has been made both bigger and smaller: bigger, because all the fathers' rooms along the main corridor have been done away with; smaller, because the recreation area has been subdivided into several rooms. Just imagine: there are two

private rooms for those who want to watch television. The larger room is for lovers of news, entertainment, and sports; the smaller one is for more serious folk. A third room is devoted to those who wish to listen to music, and a fourth to those who want to tape-record their voices or some program. All these rooms have new furniture. They have put six to eight card tables in what remains of the rec room. The whole thing is decorated in a modern style, with rather provocative colors. *O tempora, o mores!*

Bro. Gravel, who had me inspect all these changes, was very happy to inform me that all divisions between communities have been suppressed at the Curia. There is no longer a separate recreation room for the brothers; now they take their recreation in the one room common to all.

Haustus-talk: the *devotio moderna*

After finishing this tour, I made my way to the haustus room, for it was 4:30. A new surprise: they no longer have haustus at the end of the refectory and in the scullery, as they did during the first session. They have set up a special room where the coffee and the Pepsi is permanently enthroned. I met a crowd of delegates there, including our Fr. Provincial Desrochers. I had the feeling that I was meeting old friends again, a little like the old days when we would come back to school. Everyone was asking: "How are things going where you are? How far have the reforms in the Society gone? And the revolution?"

The impression that comes out of this first contact is the uneasiness that a number of people have with regard to a possible split between generations or between the scholastics and the older fathers. One provincial went so far as to say that he no longer knows which way to turn. The young men threaten to leave the Society if there aren't greater reforms, and twenty-five of the old fathers have signed a letter of protest against all the upheavals already going on, and they are also threatening to leave the Society to go and live with the Carthusians if the Society continues to secularize itself.

One especially spirited father gave us a humorous description of the situation where he was:

> We've been brought to the point where, if an old father wants to say his rosary, he has to ask permission from Fr. Rector, who habitually advises him to say it with his hand in his pocket so that he isn't reprimanded by the scholastics. If this same old father wants to make the way of the cross, oh! then he must go right to the provincial, who tells him not to do anything of the sort in front of the scholastics, but to wait until they have their holidays or are outside the house. And if this old father wants to say his Mass in

private as he used to do, then he has to write to Rome to ask for that permission from the General, especially if he intends to say it every day of the week . . . !

September 5, 1966

Hexagon or Pentagon

The dining room, too, has been transformed. They have put in hexagonal tables, and now instead of one companion for a *Deo Gratias* meal we have five. They have also put acoustical material on the walls and ceiling. But over and above all that, the General himself has been displaced. Instead of sitting at the table at the far end, as he used to, he chose a small table near the other end of the dining room. But that complicated things, because from time immemorial this end of the dining room had been reserved for the brothers, and there were some meals when the General was surrounded by them. Then some people said that this wasn't the place for the General. Now he has chosen another table near the center of the room . . . but no one knows how long that will last. One father said to me: "This is a sign that the Society is trying to find its balance: the General no longer knows where to sit in his own dining room." With these changes I lose the opportunity I had at the first session. I kept my same napkin-box, but the General not only does not enter by my door any more, but he eats at a table for six and thus will no longer have a single table-partner as before.

Triduum

The triduum has begun. I do not believe it would detract from the triduum if I were to continue my letter and write to you about Father General's points. At 9:30 everyone went to the *aula.* There were no special places, and people sat wherever they could. Out of modesty the Assistants mingled with the crowd, and I had Fr. Small, the American Assistant, next to me. I asked him what he was doing there, and he answered that it was to his advantage to leave the upper ranks and mix in with the delegates and that he would always have the opportunity of being with the other Assistants again.

Judging from the scene provided in the *aula,* most of the delegates were there making the triduum. I would say that nine-tenths were present. According to the list they gave us, our number has increased: last year we were 225; this year there are 231 of us. The title of the list reads: *ELENCHUS PATRUM SECUNDUM ORDINEM SEDENDI.* The Assistants and provincials come first. (Fr. Desrochers is No. 28 and Fr. Fortier is No. 29, and they are therefore neighbors.) There are seventy-six of them, and then begin the "ELECTORES ET PROCURATORES," numbered from 77 to 231 . . . .

The Congregation in Council

Father General came up, said the prayer, and gave us points for meditation. (The day includes one meditation in the morning and one hour of adoration in the afternoon before the Blessed Sacrament exposed.) They had undoubtedly warned the General about not speaking too rapidly, for he read the Latin text slowly and with careful articulation so that we were able to follow him easily. But just to be sure, as we left they provided us with a copy of the same text that the General had just read. Here is a resume[2] of it:

The theme of each day's conference, as one might have expected, concerned the work of the Congregation. Father General began his first talk with a reference to the will of Vatican II that every religious order or congregation hold a special General Chapter within the next couple of years to update itself according to the mind of the Church as expressed in the body of conciliar texts. Father General then went on to suggest that the Fathers might profitably put themselves in the place of those Jesuits who took part in the famous *Deliberatio Primorum Patrum* of 1539. (An English translation of that important discussion appears in the latest issue of WOODSTOCK LETTERS; all the Fathers here received copies of the Latin text and this English version.) He stated that the spirit of the Congregation's debate should be the same, though the early Fathers were true founders of the Society while the present assembly were heirs of their patrimony.

Following up this theme, Father General reminded all that they would be held responsible for what they did with this patrimony since it was given as a "talent" to them. The best guidelines they could follow here are in Paul VI's *Ecclesiam Suam.* In that 1964 encyclical, the Pope declared that no updating in the Church could be truly effective if it stemmed from archaicism, relativism, naturalism, or immobilism.

Father General then explored some thoughts on the nature of an "Ignatian election" and their applicability to the General Congregation. A valid election, he noted, presupposes: (1) genuine indifference, not one of apathy but springing from absolute preference for what Christ wills; (2) a conscious rejection of all egocentrism; (3) spiritual freedom, including especially freedom from one's own prejudices and a respect for the freedom of others as a condition of "common dialogue." Given these conditions, the Trinity can work in us. This was a commonplace of St. Ignatius' teaching.

Meaningful dialogue, on the divine model, will also mean openness to the Spirit speaking through the mediation of the Church in its pronouncements and decrees. "If our dialogue is begun in a spirit of faith, in indifference, in love of the Cross, and in spiritual freedom," Father General went on, "we will discover the suggestions of the Holy Spirit in it." This demands, he remarked, being open to light from every source, from all the rest of the Society and from the deepest yearnings of today's world.

[2] All resumés of the triduum conferences are taken from the English-language *Newsletter 21* of September 10, 1966.

Finally, the General Congregation must enter on its "election" with two key attitudes: (1) a mingling of proper modesty or humility together with inner freedom and magnanimity; (2) a "holy daring" that admits of full realism in assessing the costs and consequences of a decision but will suffer no postponement or watering down of gospel principles and Jesuit ideals. Whatever the Congregation decides, it must decide "boldly and with great confidence in the sense of vocation in Ours, both old and young."

September 6, 1966

Intermezzo—The Sound of Music

At supper last night we had a double surprise. We had been on silence since yesterday morning, that is, there was no recreation after dinner or supper. So there was no news coming from anywhere else. At supper the reader, after reading the Scripture, stopped and said something like this: "Vespere, audiemus concertum organi ex Ioannis Sebastiani Bach operibus" (This evening we will hear an organ concert from the works of Johann Sebastian Bach). I was already a little surprised to hear them telling us about an organ concert during the triduum, and I thought that this was going to be some special affair on television. But no, the organ concert took place during supper in place of the reading! I could not help smiling at hearing the first notes of Bach, but Fr. Swain, who was opposite me, gave the appearance of finding all this quite normal.

During supper I reflected on the beauty and variations of the Jesuit vocation, to the strains of Bach's "Toccata and Fugue." But that wasn't all. Right in the middle of the piece I saw one of my neighbors get up, make the sign of the cross, and leave. At first I thought that he had been called elsewhere on some urgent business, but a little while later another did the same thing. I took them for barbarians unable to appreciate the beauties of the concert, but the exodus continued. I finally realized that each one could leave when he was finished. . . .

Second Conference

For his points on the second day of the triduum Father General treated of the "special character" of our Jesuit following of Christ and the gospel. He found the key in St. Ignatius' conception of an apostle as an "instrument of God." What is there in the nature of an instrument or of instrumentality that can guide us here? Certainly we must be aware of the great need for union with the principal cause of the instrument's activity, seeing too that the greater the work the more intimate this union must be. At the same time, one needs an awareness of the weakness and limitations of the instrument. Thus, St. Ignatius could speak of "this least Society" in all sincerity.

We must have a sense, also, of the whole Society as a chosen instrument for the advance of the Kingdom. This depends, to be sure, on the disponibility of individual Jesuits, but the common aim must be to make the *whole* Society

a more perfect instrument for the "better, more solid, more universal" service of the Church. In the concrete, this demands of each man a deeper sense of union with God, of dependence on and openness to the will of the Father as "sons in the Son."

Finally, with that "marvelous realism, sense of practicality and sincerity" of St. Ignatius, we must face up to the necessity of death to the old man that the "new man" of St. Paul may come alive in us. If there are any who doubt the relevance of this consideration, they have misunderstood the very notion of participating in the mystery of Christ or else have focused on the meaning of separate acts of abnegation rather than on the "loving trust" that seeks expression in them. Here is something for both old and young in the Society to rediscover.

September 7, 1966

"Rome calling"

There is an announcement on the rec room bulletin board about the Curia acquiring a radio transmitter-receiver for the purpose of being able to contact Jesuits throughout the world. A Vatican Radio operator comes to give lessons to some of the fathers here. And here is the interesting thing for our Canadian amateurs. They advise us that if any provincial or delegate wants to speak with members of his province, he has only four conditions to fulfill, that is, to specify: (1) the day; (2) the Greenwich time; (3) the length: 20 meters; (4) the frequency. . . . The General intends to use it a good deal. . . .

Polyglot Congregation

It seems that the Latin language is going to lose its priority in the dining room. An announcement on the board tells us that at noon they will test having readings in vernacular languages. Four languages have been chosen: English, French, Spanish, and Italian. They will read excerpts from articles published in our periodicals and apt to be of interest to the fathers. I wonder if they are going to find such articles in *Relations* or *Collège et Famille* or *Actualité* or *Messager*. . . .

And still they come

We are beginning to receive new *postulata* presented by the delegates. One deals with the Gregorian University, another with the reform of the common rules, and another with the re-evaluation of the manifestation of conscience. This last one is numbered 1959. All records have been broken, and the avalanche of *postulata* continues. . . .

Third Conference

The last conference of the triduum dealt with union in the Society and specifically with personal union in the General Congregation. Father General opened by noting that the unity of the Society was a living reality for St.

Ignatius and for men like St. Francis Xavier. St. Ignatius, in fact, was convinced that a special union among Jesuits was essential for the survival of the Society and that it was equally a product of Christ's grace. We are all asked from the moment of our entrance into the Society to consider ourselves a part of it. The friendship that exists among us should thus be "fully fraternal, human, sincere, cordial, and properly the result of grace." For us Jesuits today, as for the band that gathered in Paris in 1534, our link, of course, is Christ.

Vatican II tells us that full fraternal union is the sign by which every religious family or congregation makes evident the coming of Christ (*Decree on the Appropriate Renewal of Religious Life,* No. 15). Here, then is the reason for St. Ignatius' unaccustomed sternness when he speaks of those members who threaten the unity of the Society of Jesus. Unity is essential and it is something that all must work to preserve. Particularly if we are to strive for authentic renewal and progress in unity, we must observe the rules of dialogue as laid down, for instance, by Paul VI in *Ecclesiam Suam.* At the same time we cannot ignore the importance in this regard of that "bond of wills" and "inner consensus" that should be the result of obedience and a basis of loving union in the Society. Here is one of the results that the early Fathers in their *Deliberatio* of 1539 hoped would flow from the exercise of authority in the Society as a "ministry of unity" and a "service."

On the matter of personal union in the General Congregation, Father General recalled that, if St. Ignatius saw union in general among all Jesuits as a hallmark of the Society, he looked upon a congregation as the unique celebration of that union. For him a congregation would be an event at which "the whole Society, as it were, is present." Each member of a general congregation, Father General reminded all, is to inform himself about the needs and affairs of the whole Society. Even though the electors have been named by the several provincial congregations, their real task is to do and say what they think best for the entire, undivided Society.

Once again, Father General stressed the clear importance of fostering true dialogue in the Congregation. In this regard he called attention to the deep fears expressed by St. Francis Borgia at the close of the 2nd General Congregation. The saint then voiced grave concern over the harm to union in the Society if the members of the Congregation did not let bygones be bygones and forget the debates that seem to have so deeply divided them.

On the same point of preserving union of spirits, Father General urged the Fathers to keep in mind St. Ignatius' own *Praesupponendum* at the start of the *Spiritual Exercises* for a fair hearing to every man. He also suggested that this Congregation might well borrow a lesson from a pertinent passage in Vatican II's *Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests,* No. 8: "Older priests should receive younger priests as true brothers and give them a hand with their first undertakings and assignments in the ministry. They should likewise try to understand the mentality of younger priests, even though it be different from their own, and should follow their projects with good will. For his own part, a younger priest should respect the age and experience of his seniors.

He should discuss plans with them, and willingly cooperate with them in matters which pertain to the care of souls."

September 8, 1966

A spiritual look back

The introductory triduum is finished. Now that it has been tried, I think it was a good idea, perfectly carried off. On the physical level, it was a complete success. About ninety-five percent of the delegates made the triduum. As far as I have been able to determine, there could not have been many more than a dozen missing. It is more difficult to evaluate spiritually. I think certain major ideas must have carried weight: the conditions for making a good election (i.e., for accomplishing one's duty as a member of the Congregation), the need for union with Christ to act supernaturally, and the unity which must be preserved in the Society. The doctrine is classical, even if it was dressed up with quotations from the decrees of Vatican II. Strong emphasis was put on Christ as leader of the Society, as the head from whom everything derives, as well as on the need for abnegation, fraternal charity, indifference (in the sense of preferring the will of God), etc.

Nostalgia

I must be getting old and sentimental. The other evening, at the end of an hour's adoration of the Blessed Sacrament, all the fathers present sang the *Salve Regina* after the blessing was given; and this took me thirty years back to l'Ile Saint-Ignace where we spent holidays when we were novices and juniors. As I listened to this crowd of fathers singing our old *Salve Regina* to the same melody, I saw once again our Maison de Saint-Ignace, with all of us in the tribune at ten o'clock at night singing this hymn to the Virgin, while on the river a ship slowly passed by with all its lights shining brightly. . . . Surely Rome is making me sentimental. . . . Still, there is something there—fathers from all parts of the world, of every language and nation, being able to sing that way the same praise of the Virgin in the same language to the same melody. I wonder if it will be possible to repeat this feat at the next Congregation. . . .

Music, prayer, and theology

At supper last night we had two little serenades with flute and harpsichord. They're keeping it up! After supper we had our meeting with Father General in the recreation room. We got in line, and each one in turn shook hands with the General, who had some appropriate little greeting for each of us as we went by.

Beforehand we had a Bible vigil in the chapel. Note this: the whole

thing was in French. The officiants were Frs. Giuliani (France), Franchimont (Belgium), Rondet (France), and Harvey (Canada). Fr. Giuliani, who presided, gave the homily entirely in French.

Jesuit liturgy: new and old

This morning at 8:30 we had a solemn concelebrated Mass for the official opening of the Congregation. The General was surrounded by twenty-four priests representing all the assistancies, with our Fr. Fortier (Provincial of Quebec) among them. Now *there* was a concelebration with real scope to it. At the gospel, Fr. Oñate sang in a magnificent voice the otherwise quite commonplace words, "Abraham genuit Isaac, Isaac autem genuit Jacob . . ." and so on up to "de qua natus est Christus." There are hidden talents in our Society! At the preface it was the General's turn, and he sang out with vigor and ease, using all the new melodies. It was a pleasure for me to hear our fine new preface for solemn feasts. And there was something else new. The twenty-four concelebrants sang—that's right, sang—the Canon of the Mass together, even the "Hoc est . . . meum." I learn something new every day.

September 9, 1966

Today it is hot, just as it was during those fine days of the first session. In other words, the thermometer is hovering between 85° and 90°, and sometimes it goes up to 95°. This means that the delegates are much more attracted toward the Pepsi supply, to which has been added this year a new sign: MIRINDA, a kind of orange juice made by the same Pepsi company. As for the Pope, he is at Castel Gandolfo and has not seen us since we arrived. These meetings around the Pepsi cooler are very useful for picking up news and getting to know one another. Fr. Irénée Desrochers takes considerable advantage of this . . . and I am keeping an eye on his instruction. In the last issue of *America*, I read the article by Fr. Leary entitled "The Wisdom of Being Apart," on the need to maintain grammar schools, secondary schools, and Catholic universities in the United States. I was engaged in discussion with the author, who is present at the Congregation, and was congratulating him on taking a stand and telling him that in Canada the same problem has arisen, when Fr. Desrochers arrived. I told Fr. Leary, "Here is someone you must get to read your article. He's our new provincial and he has to make some decisions on this very matter of the future of our secondary schools." They introduced themselves, and Fr. Desrochers told him that he, too, had just finished reading his article. This pleased Fr. Leary, because all this uproar being made in the United States aimed at getting the Jesuits to abandon their high schools and

universities seems artificial to him: "Who's asking for this? Not our present students, not our alumni, not the parents of our students—but Catholics who want to get completely mixed in with the general mass of the population, and also Jesuits who no longer want to teach in our high schools and universities. . . ." Fr. Carrier was passing by at that moment, and I caught him, too, to read the article and chat with Fr. Leary. Two more articles are coming on the topic.

Linguistic poles

I've already said that with the new arrangement of tables in the dining room I lost my chance to land at the General's table. It seems now that the matter is definitely closed since the General has been given a place right in the middle of the refectory, by the wall. I would have to go back half the length of the refectory to reach there. However, I notice the new system favors small groupings by language. With the huge tables used before, you took your place in the next spot when you got there, without worrying about who was next to you. But now, little by little, the tables are being filled, if not according to nationality, at least according to language.

The difficulties of the job

Last night, during recreation after supper, I went up to the roof to take a walk with a group of French fathers. When they saw me arrive, one of them shouted out!

Silence! Quiet! Mum's the word! Anything you say to him is liable to be reported to Canada and eventually wind up back in France. Listen to what happened to me last year. Father came up to me and said: "Fr. Socius of Montreal would like to know if you have *déphasés* fathers, and what you do with them."

All unsuspecting, I replied: "Do we have any *déphasés*?! Enough to populate your entire province!"

"But what do you do with them?"

At that point another father, a delegate from the Near East, immediately answered: "He sends them to the Near East."

I had completely forgotten this incident until, one fine day, I received a phone call from a father arriving from the Near East: "So! I'm a *déphasé*!" I was surprised and didn't understand what he meant, and so I asked him about it. "Why, at Rome, during the General Congregation, you said that you send these *déphasés* to the Near East."

"I beg your pardon. I'm not the one who said that. It was a father from the Near East. But who told you about this?"

"I read it in a series of letters by a Canadian father. . . ."

Now you understand why I say "Silence!" Anything you say is liable to be interpreted against you.

None of this prevented the group from speaking as freely as before. . . .

Aside from the concelebrated Mass, the opening day of this second session was relatively free of ceremony. Shortly after the Mass, the Fathers took their assigned places in the aula. . . . The meeting began with a brief prayer and then Father General's address[3]. . . .

Father General's allocution: Great Expectations

The talk opened with some remarks on the importance and difficulty of the job ahead. Then Father General reviewed in some detail the work of preparation that had gone on during the intersession. Finally, he discussed what the Society expected of the Congregation and what it should do in response.

In some ways, Father General said at the start, this session faces a harder job than the first, even though it has the help of the decress of Vatican II and the advantage that the members know one another, have had experience and added study, and can profit from the work of the *periti* and others. Still, the problems this session faces are harder because of the nature of the subjects to be treated and of developments in the intersession. At the same time, expectations both inside and outside the Society are great. The fact is that the Congregation faces "profound, complicated, and immense problems of every sort" and it faces them in what some call "a period of transition; others, of crisis; others, of evolution; others, of degeneration; others, of imminent chaos."

In speaking of preparations for the second session, Father General first mentioned the work of the Coordinating Committee under the direction of Fr. Vincent O'Keefe. He singled out for special praise the *periti* or experts, particularly those who had been associated with the work of Vatican II, for their generous work. Then he reviewed briefly a series of other meetings and events that contributed at least indirectly to the work of preparation: (1) approval by the Pope of the first session's determination on poverty; (2) work by Frs. John McGrail and Ansgar Simmel on setting up simultaneous translation systems for meetings of the Congregation that are not official; (3) various meetings of experts with a view to setting up a Council of Technical Advisors to the General: (a) on communications media, under Fr. Robert Claude; (b) on renovation and development of Vatican Radio; (c) on Ignatian spirituality, under Fr. Maurice Giuliani at Paris, and on the Exercises, under Frs. John Swain and Clemente Espinosa, at Loyola in Spain; (d) on financial operations, under Frs. Romulus Durocher and Raymond Walter together with several lay experts; (e) on educational work and the creation of a center for research and coordination, under Frs. Vincent O'Keefe and John Blewett; (f) on missionary work, one gathering of mission superiors at Syracuse, N.Y., in the United States of America, and two similar meetings in Rome; (g) on aid to less developed areas; (h) on public relations, under Fr. Vincent O'Keefe; (i) on social questions and social science, with 25 experts meeting here in Rome; (j) on a sociological survey of the whole Society, with the same experts; (k) on confronting the challenge of atheism, under Fr. Andrew Varga; (l) on work with international organizations, with fathers in that work meeting in Paris; (4) study of letters from province and house consultors

[3] The following summary is taken from *Newsletter 21.*

in order to review the true state of the Society and particularly the problem of defections; (5) Father General's own visits to Northern Italy, the Near East, Africa, France, and the United States of America, which he regards as a great benefit and the result of a wise recommendation from the first session of the General Congregation.

Under the heading of expectations for the General Congregation, Father General spoke first of the variety of attitudes towards the Congregation and then of what the Congregation should set as its goals. There are, in the first place, some who expect from the Congregation the answers to all problems, including those of a doctrinal nature, even though the Congregation is only "a sort of legislative body that lays down norms and practical criteria and does not dare to enunciate doctrinal solutions." Others stand off in indifference and give almost the impression of not regarding themselves as members of the same family. Still others are fearful of the Congregation, either because it may change so many things that they won't recognize the Society anymore, or because it will lack breadth of vision, openness and daring to do all that should be done. Finally, there are those who have a calm, realistic confidence that the Congregation will come up with all the necessary answers, even though not with the answer to everything.

What is the Congregation to do? Father General proposed four main tasks. The first, to affirm our basic principles in a clear, intelligible fashion. This will demand sincere freedom of spirit and a sense of the supernatural logic taught by St. Ignatius in the *Exercises* and *Constitutions*. The statement of principles must be one that can be understood by both old and young, though both may have to accommodate themselves to its phrasing in some degree. In making it, however, the Congregation must beware of historicism, psychologicism, triumphalism, immobilism, or progressism. More specifically, Father General stressed that the Congregation must not be overtimid. Rather, it should say what must be said about our basic principles without fear of offending the younger members of the Society. The young of today admire sincerity, daring, realism, and brevity. Let the Congregation, then, follow the gospel injunction: "Let your speech be Yea, Yea, and No, No" (Matt. 5:37). To speak otherwise, to take refuge in beautifully phrased bromides, would not satisfy the generous youth of today.

Secondly, the Congregation must seek to clarify the concrete application of these principles to situations of today's world. This will require careful use of the discernment of spirits and the rules for election, as well as a sketching out of the proper countenance of a twentieth-century Jesuit.

The third task should be to consider how best to go about forming or developing such a Jesuit as the Congregation envisions. This will mean taking a realistic, even perhaps a radical, look at the whole present structure of formation in the Society.

Finally, the Congregation must concern itself with building up a sense or understanding of common life and community. "In a word," Father General concluded, "if we wish to achieve unity in today's Society, it will help to have a well-defined goal, to map out the path wisely, and to set forth proper guidelines with loftiness of vision and sincerity."

There has been little new since my last letter. The Congregation is digesting the tons of paper prepared for it between the sessions; it has not yet begun to sit in full session. I have spent the morning reading the results of the work done by the experts and the *periti* called upon between the two sessions.

From an experienced spiritual father

It seems to me that you would be interested in knowing some of the observations on the spiritual life in the Society. Here are some that came from an American father:

. . . The Congregation should not be content with producing abstract decrees and pointing out the ideal to be attained; it should also indicate the concrete means of making these decrees and this ideal become part of Jesuit living. Otherwise, they will be received as mere wishful thinking. If the Congregation really wants Jesuits to have a better formation with regard to the Spiritual Exercises, it should not be content with formulating an ideal, but it should give concrete directives.

The annual retreat

For a few years we have to allow wide room for experimentation. For example, after three or four years in the Society, our scholastics should be able to enjoy greater initiative in making their annual retreat. The retreat master could give points twice a day and make some suggestions concerning the matter for the other meditations of the day, or attendance at points could be *ad libitum* several times a day. That would allow the retreat master to devote more time to the scholastics, either individually or in small groups.

Exercises of piety

The Congregation ought to produce a statement on the necessity of Jesuits being men of a solid interior life if they wish to respond to the needs of the world and of the Church. Many Jesuits today doubt that it is useful or necessary to be entirely known by their superior, because most of the time, especially in large communities, the superior is rather an administrator.

Every decree on mental prayer should be preceded by a pastoral declaration on the place and need for prayer in the Society today. Decrees will not be enough to satisfy the aspirations of the younger men. The declaration in question should not be made up of citations from the *Constitutions,* but it should be adapted to the way of thinking of today's Jesuit. It will have to answer the most current objections now in circulation.

I believe there are more things going on each moment in people's lives today than was the case in the days of St. Francis Borgia and Fr. Aquaviva. Modern man is much quicker at getting down to work. A simple comparison between modern spiritual literature and the spiritual writing of the Borgia-Aquaviva era clearly shows that "a much more business-like approach to spiritual matters is characteristic of our age." Having to face an hour of prayer, today's scholastics, even the best of them, spend a good part of this

time for prayer waiting for the bell to ring. This problem will not be solved by better spiritual direction, better instruction in prayer, or a more mortified life. There are some excellent scholastics who have had all that and who, despite that, do not know what to do during the hour of meditation. Therefore one solution remains: to cut this hour of meditation in half.

The examination of conscience

The Congregation should put out a pastoral declaration on the place of the examination of conscience in the life of a Jesuit, showing that, instead of being a concentration on one's own sins, it ought to be an exercise in the discernment of spirits, a help in finding God in all things. The Congregation should also abandon a fixed length of time and specify that the examen should be made twice a day, when this is *reasonably* possible. . . .

There you have a resumé of the observations made by a good American spiritual father. And this is only one of many reports sent to us. . . .

September 15, 1966

The Congregation is getting under way slowly, too slowly to suit those thinking about the possibility of returning home by the end of October. This morning in the reading room an American reading the New York *Herald Tribune* suddenly came across an article that seemed to amuse him very much, and he exclaimed: "That's for us; that should be our motto!" Some others went over, and he told them: Read this—the paper's announcing the end of the Congregation. Across half the page was a large headline: "HOME FOR CHRISTMAS." In fact, however, it was about ending the war in Vietnam and bringing the American soldiers back for Christmas. . . .

Music in the dining room—Bach, Haydn, Handel—continues to delight us each evening. This innovation stirs up some lively discussions at recreation. Someone referred us to the article in the September, 1966, *Études* by Henri Engelman: "Musique pour tous."

Psychoanalysis

A provincial indicated the conditions he set for those fathers who ask to be allowed to undergo psychoanalysis: (1) that the father continue working; (2) that a supervisor of the dialogue be present; (3) that the father being psychoanalyzed also have a dialogue with his own spiritual father; and (4) that the treasurer agree to pay. . . .

We wanted more details on two of these conditions. It seemed that the first condition is the most effective: ergotherapy, that is, treatment by work. Many fathers have complexes because they are not working enough or because the work they are doing is not suited to their psychological condition. It is the role of the ergotherapist to find the kind of work that fits each one, but it must be a work that at least

defrays the cost of the treatment the father undergoes. As to the second condition, it consists in giving the father asking to undergo psychoanalysis someone who will observe him while he dialogues with others and, to begin with, to see if he actually does it.

Renewal in procedure

The first two sessions have, in effect, been taken up with procedural questions. It was necessary, for example, to vote on whether the Congregation would excuse Fr. Jean d'Auteuil Richard, the former Provincial of Montreal, from coming to Rome.

The procedure has been completely recast, introducing, for example, points of order, which some people seem to be just discovering. Just as at the Council, the Congregation has provided itself with a council of moderators, leaving to the General the task of naming its members. These are Frs. Dezza, Calvez, and Klubertanz. Yesterday Fr. Dezza presided at the session, with Father General present. The experience of the first session had shown that it was a great deal to ask of one and the same man, Father General, to preside over and direct all the debates every single day. . . . The General takes part in the sessions at his place, but it is the vice-president he has named who is in charge of the debates. As he usually does, Fr. Dezza carried out this job magnificently.

The first point submitted to the examination of the delegates has been a schema entitled *De conservatione et renovatione Instituti nostri.* This poor schema had been almost completely drafted last year and then finished this year before the opening of the session. The observations made on this topic by no means foreshadowed the storm that was going to sweep down on it. The storm began with the comparison some people attempted to make between the letter and spirit of this schema and the documents of Vatican II, and especially the *Motu proprio* of Paul VI, *Ecclesiae Sanctae.*

Here, for example, are some of the remarks made about this schema: "Mihi omnino non placet. . . . Sapit triumphalismum et spirat conservatismum." What attitude is the Congregation going to take with regard to the directives of *Ecclesiae Sanctae* and the decrees *Christus Dominus* and *Perfectae Caritatis*? Are we going to integrate them wholly into the renewal of our Institute, or are we going to content ourselves with a passing nod and afterwards have our own way? In *Ecclesiae Sanctae* it says: "14. Those matters which are now obsolete . . . should be excluded from the fundamental code of the institutes. . . . 17. Those elements are to be considered obsolete which do not constitute the nature and purpose of the institute and which, having lost their meaning and power, are no longer a real help to religious life." Now, the schema presented

to us aims at a fuzzy kind of canonization of everything that comes from the past. Even if the word *renewal* is there, the reality isn't there. . . .

This impression has been very strong. At our second full session a father proposed a point of order which would come down to sending the schema back to its commission to have it redone and adapted according to the letter and spirit of Vatican II and *Ecclesiae Sanctae*. And this is the way the Congregation voted. It really seems that this document *Ecclesiae Sanctae* is going to exercise a great influence on the Congregation and that certain schemas that would have easily passed last year have no chance of being adopted this year. That means that the renewal promises to be much more adequate and profound than it could have been at the time of the first session.

September 16, 1966

Little détente

A good number of fathers were in front of the television yesterday afternoon watching the re-entry and splashdown of the American astronauts Conrad and Gordon. It was a fascinating thing to watch. This broadcast went from 3:30 to 4:30 P.M. At 5 P.M. our session began; the American fathers were glowing.

Television takes over

The organizer of the night-time colloquies, talks, and conferences last year, has let it be known that the same sort of things will be impossible this year because of television and, in particular, because of the news program that comes on precisely at the time for recreation. . . .

The Communist dialogue

I was opposite a Belgian father at the noon meal yesterday. They had just read an article in Spanish from *Razon y Fe* on a Catholic-Communist colloquy in which Roger Garaudy and Fr. Karl Rahner, among others, took part. At Deo Gratias this father said: "I've talked with Garaudy; he's a charming man. He thinks of himself as forming part of the egghead brigade of the Communist Party."

On my right there was a Polish father who had taken refuge in London and who was serving as a substitute for the fathers who could not come from Poland. He said to me: "The Communists are all for dialogue as long as they're not in power; as soon as they are, there's no longer any question of having dialogue." I asked him if there was any chance that the Polish fathers would be able to come to the Congregation. He answered me: "It's better that they not come." And, in response to my surprised look, he added: "They will then be on the same footing as the bishops (who cannot leave Poland), and the whole Polish nation

will know that the government didn't allow the Jesuits to go to Rome for their General Congregation. . . . It's better if it works out that way. . . ."

The difficulties of drafting a text

The situation is different in each province or in each country. In one province, for example, there is no room for Jesuits either in education or in pastoral work, since the secular clergy takes care of that and, in general, does a good job. The fathers are in para-priestly works and are satisfied with them. A text obliging priests to do pastoral work would run the risk of being inapplicable in this province.

Another case: one Jesuit works in astronomy and maintains that he is fulfilling his Jesuit and priestly vocation, while another will not admit that a Jesuit priest should just carry on secular activity without ever doing pastoral work.

Another difficulty: in the United States the Society is especially successful when there is a community carrying on a common work; therefore, we have to recommend those works in which the Society is acting as such. But, the French, Belgians, and Canadians would answer, in our situation we are prepared to accept a well-prepared Jesuit who will work at his specialty but not at the same time to have the whole community backing him up.

Father General intervenes

At the same session yesterday, during which a father had urged the General to intervene to put a stop to certain unfortunate experiments, Father General made a statement, the substance of which I will give you here:

All of us are for the spiritual renewal of the Society. That is the thing that matters, much more than the renewal of texts, even if this also has to be done. Unfortunately, renewal and adaptation are too often carried out today according to the method of "faits accomplis," something that has ill-fated consequences. This method continues to exist because superiors are pulled in every direction and do not have clear directives coming from the Congregation. Therefore, this Congregation has to map out the way, indicate the goals to be attained, the reforms that are necessary, and the means for accomplishing them. If the Congregation succeeds in this task, I am confident that the sounder elements in the Society will follow and will carry out the needed reforms.

We have very often alluded to the documents of Vatican II, to the decree *Perfectae Caritatis*, and to the rules for their application in *Ecclesiae Sanctae*. In my capacity as superior general I took part in the commission which prepared these decrees and rules. I personally have been greatly surprised at the respect and the reverence that the others show toward the Institute of the Society. The things we are ready to throw overboard are often the very things

the other congregations envy us and admire the most about us. The Sovereign Pontiff, when he spoke to the members of our commission, said that he wished above all for a renewal of the religious spirit, an adaptation that would bring about greater holiness in the life of each religious.

Father General ended his remarks with these words: "Mediocritas hodie permitti non potest in vita religiosa!" (Mediocrity cannot be permitted in religious life today.)

This evening we are beginning the discussion on grades in the Society. Each camp is gathering its ammunition.

September 17, 1966

"Assueta vilescunt"

The proverb *assueta vilescunt* is being realized, and a good deal of the wonder of last year has fallen off. . . . Perhaps, too, life at the Curia has become simpler, more ordinary, less liable to inspire awe. The dining room, for example, is completely transformed. When we arrived for the first session, the tables of honor, where the Vicar General, and then all the Assistants, sat, was quite a spectacle to behold. It was a forbidden place for the rest of us. . . . Some time after the General's election, the Assistants began to mix in with the other delegates. Today we don't even know where the General is any longer, and the Assistants are spread out throughout the whole dining room. I had two of them at my table at noon, and our table seemed quite ordinary.

The General also contributes to this loosening up. When he shows up somewhere—in the recreation room, or at haustus (at 11 A.M. or 4 P.M., for now there is a morning haustus with cheese, coffee, and Pepsi), life goes on, and he himself mixes in with the groups. . . .

"This is Father General . . ."

One of the General's favorite pastimes is trying out his new radio and contacting Jesuits throughout the world. Last night an American father succeeded in speaking with him, and the General was able to make out part of his transmission.

A third session . . . grades

Hang on to your hat! They've begun talking about a third session, perhaps without putting much credence in it, but they're talking about it! The occasion for this has been the debate that has resumed on the question of the abolition of grades. Some people have made this the sign par excellence of the Society's *aggiornamento*. Last year a similar debate, a very animated and impassioned one, took place, but the Congregation decided then by a two-thirds majority to keep grades in the Society, while making profession more accessible to a greater number.

Consequently, the subcommission had prepared a decree setting forth the new conditions for admission to solemn profession, conditions which reduced the importance of the famous *ad grad* exam. It is this text which is now before the Congregation for approval. One after another, the adversaries of grades have taken advantage of the fact that this discussion had been started to call for the suppression of grades and to ask to have the debate on grades reopened. But this question is one of the substantials of the Institute and requires a qualified majority for it to be discussed and still another to be changed. Moreover, it is necessary to have the approbation of the Holy See, whence the suggestion or, if you wish, the threat of a third session. . . .

The two days devoted to this question have been quite lively. One of the principal arguments invoked is that the conciliar documents, including the decree *Perfectae Caritatis* and the *Motu proprio Ecclesiae Sanctae*, call for this move. But people do not agree on the implications of these documents.

One father was of the opinion that we should follow the example given with regard to the poverty question, The Congregations that preceded our own prepared the ground; our Congregation cannot immediately settle such a problem, but it can pronounce on the principle involved and entrust the further work to a commission. . . . If *we* embark upon this enterprise, all the other problems will be delayed all the more, and then a third session will be needed. In that case, I would immediately ask to pass to the rank of spiritual coadjutor!

Another declared: Since we're involved in getting rid of distinctions, I asked that the coadjutor brothers also be admitted to the solemn profession. They're part of the same family and often deserve the title as much as the others who have it now.

. . . If we embark upon this question, the Congregation is going to last longer than the Council. . . . Let's not forget that a commission is busy revising the canon law of the Church. Therefore, let's not be in too much of a hurry to change our *Constitutions*, for fear that our changes will not agree with the demands of the new canon law and that we may have to begin all over again later on.

I have saved for the end the chief attraction among the interventions, one by an Indian father:

In India, in my country, we used to have the caste system, a system that had some value in times past. But later on we made a new constitution, and we abolished this system. If non-Christians, inspired by human motives, were able to make such a gesture, how is it that we who are Christians and who ought to be inspired by supernatural motives would not dare to abolish the caste system that prevails in the Society?

And raising his voice, the father shouted out with mighty indignation, as did Cato of old: "Ego dico: ABOLENDA EST ista distinctio graduum!"

This father spoke without reading, improvising as he went along, gesturing, and raising his voice. The Congregation listened to him as it has rarely listened to any speaker, and—an extraordinary thing—it applauded him when he finished his intervention. Several people went up to congratulate him as we left.

If I were to judge from the interventions made by the fathers from India, it would seem that this distinction of grades causes scandal in that country, since it is undoubtedly reminiscent of the distinction of castes.

The discussion is going to resume. It is worth noting that no one up to now has criticized the new decree before the Congregation, but that everyone has been attacking the very structure of grades in the Society. At some point the Congregation will have to make a decision on the advisibility or inadvisibility of taking back last year's vote, which, by the necessary two-thirds, was not in favor of suppressing grades.

For the moment, it is not easy to foresee how the majority will decide, nor even whether a qualified majority can be obtained on such a topic at the present Congregation.

September 20, 1966

Walking in the Square

The other night I was walking in St. Peter's Square at around nine o'clock; it was nearly deserted. I was with an American father and a young provincial from India, an intelligent and likable man. He told us that the Jesuits of his province (about 400 of them) are far from being troubled and tormented as those of Europe or America are. Only some of them, the ones who read European periodicals, raise the same problems as in those countries. I asked him if the problem of priestly celibacy comes up in his province. He said that it doesn't, because priestly celibacy is just about the only external that draws the attention of Indians to Catholic priests. The vow of obedience is something that can't be seen. The vow of poverty isn't any more evident, since in India Jesuit poverty is not a sign for external edification, given the fact that the vast majority of the population lives in greater poverty. This leaves the vow of chastity: this is the great Catholic, religious sign, the one that attracts the people and young men to the Society. And so they don't talk about priests getting married in his province.

My other companion shares Fr. Rahner's vision of the future of Catholicism and the Church in the world: he sees both of them dimin-

ishing in numbers, while huge non-Christian masses of humanity are being formed, masses over which the Church has no hold. This is the *pusillus grex* theory, according to which Catholics are destined to become an ever smaller minority in a vast world. The father also applies this theory to the Society. In the United States, as in Canada, he believes, the Society has reached its apogee and can only go into a decline. Our formation drives us in this direction. We take young men full of life and enthusiasm, and we put them into those deep-freezers and brainwashing machines we call our novitiates and scholasticates. At the end of ten years of this treatment, they have become incapable of thinking for themselves or of revolutionizing anything whatever—and do you think that that's going to result in Jesuits setting the world on fire? They're barely capable of going out and buying bus tickets for themselves!

The young provincial from India listened with attention. He found the father's remarks stimulating and provocative, but he did not share them entirely, at least not for his own province. He recalled that he has often heard the Society blamed for taking in the best boys in the schools and not always making first-raters of them in its ministries. I pointed out to him that, this very noon, a master of novices reminded us of the question that Fr. Nadal had already asked during the first years of the Society: "How does it happen that, with such good colts, we end up with such bad horses?"

Obedience

This whole question of obedience, my companion said, has come down to restudying the function of society today and of the work to be done in it by the Society. We must rid it of all the vestiges of monastic orders and feudal society; we live in a pluralistic, democratic society, one that is open and subject to rapid change. The problem being posed, consequently, is one of maintaining cooperation without destroying personal initiative and responsibility.

The superior should direct the whole community and its members, who are supposed to be adults. For the authority-obedience polarity to function well, superiors and inferiors must be equally devoted to the work of the apostolate; it is the whole community, superiors and inferiors, which should feel responsible for the growth of the Mystical Body around it and within it. A Jesuit consecrated, by his vows, to the apostolate has the duty of developing himself, for if superiors are to make use of him somewhere, they ought to have something to make use of. . . . The young men must be reminded of their present duty while being made aware of the needs of the society in which they live and of its present and future needs, not those of the past.

Obedience will be an acute question when it comes up in the Congregation. No less provocative is the small pamphlet *Obedience and Authority*, published by the America Press, which the American fathers have just put in the reading room. The first article is entitled "Loyal Opposition in the Church."[4] This is the time, it writes, when tensions are rising in the Church over the subject of obedience. What is to be done when the authorities oppose changes that seem desirable? Some quite simply disobey, others decide they can do nothing. Both are mistaken, for a third way exists, that of loyal opposition in the Church. The Church is the people of God, the whole Church, not just the hierarchy or superiors, but the whole people. The author traces the role of loyal opposition in the Church and concludes: "Let those take heart whom responsibility compels on a given question to stand fully obedient, but in the opposition. They are serving the Church. They are the Church."

At work

I have just come from a three-hour session. Several decrees have been revoked and replaced by others more in conformity with the way of thinking of the Vatican II Church. In the future, provincial congregations will be allowed to treat the substantials of the Institute.

At the session just ended; those opposed to grades in the Society were to continue their argumentation. Sixteen had already handed in their names, and almost as many were preparing to follow them. In the face of this avalanche, the commission decided to put the question directly to the Congregation: Does it wish to reopen the debate? If not, the speakers will have to confine themselves to a criticism of the decree before them; if it does, then a whole new procedure would be introduced, involving a certain number of questions, the last of which would lead to a vote on the complete suppression of grades. The vote appeared to be of such importance that the Congregation decided to postpone it until tomorrow morning so that each one would have time to form a clear and accurate idea of the question.

September 21, 1966

Divertissement

Next week an important theological congress opens in Rome, and people here are asking about the attitude the Pope will take on the doctrinal questions. In any case, a notice posted on the board invites the fathers to attend the conferences to be given at night by some of these theologians, for example, Frs. Chenu and John Courtney Murray. The title of the congress is "The Church Between Council and Synod."

[4] By J. G. Milhaven, S.J.—ED.

The Society's image at the Vatican

Thunderbolt at the Congregation! At the beginning of the day's session, Father General took the floor and gave us an important communication. He had seen the Sovereign Pontiff. The Pope had shared with him his desires and wishes with regard to the Society in general and the present Congregation in particular. From the reports coming from the nuncios and apostolic delegates throughout the whole world, the Pope gave the General a sketch of the image which the Society projects at present, and this image needs serious retouching. The Pope did not wish to speak in public, for the press would be able to seize upon his statements and do more harm than good, but he confided fully in the General, commissioning him to communicate to the Congregation the wishes of the Pope. And for a good quarter of an hour, the General exposed for us, point by point, what the Pope had told him. Unfortunately for you and for me, the General ended by asking all of us to keep the content of the Pope's message to the Congregation secret, at least until further notice. I'm losing the biggest scoop of the year . . . and so is *Lettres de Rome*. . . .

Grades again

And the debates resume. The Congregation is literally hypnotized by the problem of grades. . . . To believe some people, only the abolition of grades can restore the younger men's confidence and make the crooked ways straight.

I admit that the problems of the spiritual life seem to me to be a great deal more important and more urgent, but there is nothing to be done; we will just have to reopen the debate on the abolition of grades. Yesterday sixteen speakers took the floor on this subject, but they said little that we had not heard before. . . .

After all these fine speeches, a vote was taken to find out if we were going to reopen the debate, and the Congregation voted for the affirmative. Over and above that, the first two weeks of October have been set aside for this question. This means that it will not be before the middle of October that the Congregation will tackle the really essential questions, such as those on religious life, the apostolate, discipline, the vows of obedience and chastity, the reforms called for by the Council and the Pope. I'm beginning to believe that the newspaper was telling the truth when it said: "Home for Christmas"!

Grinding on

After this success, the Congregation grappled with another marginal problem. Some people think that there are too many delegates to the Congregation and that the number has to be reduced. And so a com-

mission was named to study the problem, it made its report, and the discussion was opened. Here again, partisans and adversaries faced each other. One said: If the delegates are chosen well, there is no need to have a big number. It is up to the provincial congregations to do their job well. Another came out in opposition to a reduction in the number of delegates, that is, from three for each province (the argument is that the large provinces should have a representation in proportion to the number of their members). In international organizations, he said, the United Nations, for example, the small countries have the right to the same representation as the large nations; Uruguay has the same number of official delegates as the United States. At the Congregation, the elector represents the whole Society, not just a faction, a section, or a province.

Another answered that there is a considerable difference in the number of professed among the different provinces and that the greater the number of professed, the greater should be the representation. The response to this was that the argument from size is one that persuades only those who are already persuaded. The same holds true for the argument that the provinces with the most members are the ones that have the most complex problems. On the contrary, it turns out that these provinces are homogeneous, while some small mission provinces are very complex, formed from different races, languages, cultures, etc. If the provincials of the large provinces are afraid of seeing their problems neglected, let them do what the bishops did at the Council, bring their experts with them: sociologists, jurists, theologians, etc.

Someone proposed holding regional congregations in which delegates from the provinces would come together and choose some from their own number to be sent to the general congregation. Another observed that the Curia has reached the saturation point for housing everybody who comes, and he suggested holding the next Congregation at the Colegio Latino-Americano, where there is air to breathe, plus more than 300 rooms.

Another one said: "You're trying to square a circle; you want to reduce the number of delegates, and at the same time you want to increase the representation of the large provinces. He suggested a fixed number: Let's put it at 100, and let each province have its proportional representation.

Someone else was opposed to all reductions. It would be the smallest provinces that would suffer; most of the time, these would be the mission provinces, the ones that are the most important for the future of the Church. The disadvantages of large numbers are nothing compared to the disadvantages that would arise if we reduced the representation

of the small provinces. Consider what happened at the Vatican Council. There were more than 2000 bishops there, and yet they ended up finding the formula for running the Council, with only one bishop from the smallest diocese not present.

Finally, an old campaigner, who was attending his third General Congregation, came up and said: All your arguments for reducing the number—more fraternal contacts, more efficient work, etc.—aren't worth much. I've taken part in the previous Congregations, where we were much less numerous, and I can tell you that our contacts weren't more personal and our work wasn't more efficient. . . .

September 22, 1966

"Selective faith"

Last night we had a good discussion with some Americans about the *Time* article (September 16) on Catholicism in the United States (p. 60: "Roman Catholics, Selective Faith"). According to this article, young Catholics are more and more inclined to judge for themselves what they should take or leave in Catholic doctrine. In the past, a Catholic who did not want to accept the entire teaching had no other choice but to leave the Church; today, many consider themselves free to ignore or to put aside important points of doctrine and still remain in the Church. The point under discussion last night was that the same thing was happening in the Society. Faith becomes selective, that is, some Jesuits select only what *they* want to get involved with in the Society and still they remain in it with no feeling of remorse.

The article goes on to point out that a good number of baptized Catholics live their lives outside of official Catholicism; they do not leave the Church, but they no longer participate in its life. They say: "I'm a Catholic, but I no longer take the Church seriously." One person in our group said that this is the way some Jesuits act with regard to the Society: they call themselves Jesuits, but no longer take part in the life of the Society and no longer take it seriously.

For these Catholics, everything traditional and institutional becomes an object of contempt and something to be discarded. Thus the Church is passing through "a cultural crisis of the first order of magnitude." What happened to the Jews and to the Protestants is going to happen to the Church: within one and the same community of faith, it will have to allow a whole rage of opinions, from the most complete submission to the most radical kind of questioning. It seems that this phenomenon is reaching the Society in the United States and in Canada. But can the Society allow such tolerance and still continue to be the Society? The question is haunting the Curia's recreation rooms, corridors,

and private rooms before it enters the *aula*, as it soon will . . . when we take up the problems of the spiritual life, discipline, and the vows.

Introspection

In the *aula*, talk has resumed on the advisibility of reducing the number of delegates to the general congregation. There was nothing new, and not a great deal that was interesting. One speaker compared the congregation to Noah's ark: it's not necessary to have everybody get in, but a pair well chosen is sufficient. . . .

Book-hunting

While ferreting about in the basement, I came upon a place which our Father Librarian would certainly call a depository, if not a dumping-ground: a place filled with old papers, old boxes, old cartons, etc., and surrounded by shelves on which old issues of the *Memorabilia S.I.* and the *Annuarium S.I.* lie for ages to come. I climbed a winding staircase and found myself in the main library of the Curia. This was the first time that I had set foot in it, and I took advantage of the occasion to examine the situation there. A huge catalogue is enthroned in the center of things, and it's divided into three sections: author, subject, and place. On the lower tier the periodicals are classified according to assistancies. A section is reserved for Canada, and I discovered our publications there carefully bound. . . .

The Jesuit librarian asked me if I was looking for something in particular. I said: "Yes, there are two recent works I would like to consult, one by Harvey Cox, *The Secular City*, and the other by Karl Rahner, *Peut-on croire aujourd 'hui*?" He immediately replied that he didn't have either one. As for Harvey Cox, the librarian did not seem to know either the name or the book. America is far away, and Cox does not seem to have penetrated the Curia as he has the American and Canadian scholasticates. I will just have to wait, then, unless I follow an American father's advice and borrow the copy belonging to the Assistant from the United States. . . .

Some decisions

When I came out of today's session of the Congregation, I realized that it had been much shorter than I had thought. The main reason for that is that the Congregation voted to preserve, quite simply, the old state of affairs regarding the number of delegates to the general congregation, that is, the provincial and two elected delegates—all that, after three days of debate. It also voted on having the Assistants take part in general congregations, and it began the debate on coadjutor brothers.

THE COMMUNITY IN RELATION TO THE APOSTOLATE

Norbert J. Rigali, S.J.

growth in the understanding and living of Jesuit community life

If the purpose of our discussion on the community in relation to the apostolate is to promote development in the understanding and living of community life in our apostolic order, what is presupposed by the very scheduling of this discussion is that there is room and need for such development. A possible point of departure, then, which the discussion could take, is to examine this presupposition, asking *why* there is need today for growth in the understanding and living of Jesuit community life. This is the point of departure adopted here, since it seems to be the approach best suited for achieving valid practical conclusions. For, to ask why there is need for growth in our understanding of community life is to ask what is wrong with our present understanding of it. The most intelligent way to improve something is to see clearly first just what it is that needs improvement and why.

It seems that our notion of community life is directly dependent on at least two contexts: moral theology and ecclesiology. Since moral theology is concerned with how the Christian should live and act, it must influence directly the way in which the religious understands how he should live and act in his specific form of the Christian life, religious community life. Since religious community life is by its very nature a certain kind of life within the Church, the manner in which the Church is understood must likewise determine directly the way in which community life is conceived.

Consequently, a deficiency in the methodology of moral theology or in our understanding of the Church must be expected to produce an inadequate notion of religious community.

As is well known, it is axiomatic among many theologians today that moral theology became legalistic. Equally well known is the fact that there is presently great ferment in this discipline, as moral theologians, confronted by a very serious and urgent challenge, work diligently to transform their science into one which is truly scriptural and theological. But if it is true that moral theology has been legalistic and insufficiently theological, the operative notion of community life can hardly have been otherwise.

That our understanding of the Church may be deficient will not seem to be a far-fetched idea, to be written off immediately, if we recall that in his allocution inaugurating the second session of Vatican II Pope Paul set as the first of the four goals of the Council a new, more adequate self-understanding of the Church. It is not strange, he said, if even after almost twenty centuries, the Church discovers that it needs a better understanding of just what it is, since the Church is ultimately a mystery.[1] Similarly, it is not surprising that the Society after four centuries finds itself today in need of a better understanding of just what it is and what its community life is. Indeed the Society must experience this need after Vatican II, if the Society has meaning and can be understood only within the context of the Church.

Primarily through its *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* the Council fulfilled the first of its goals. Here a new mentality or perspective is presented: the Church is "the new People of God," the "messianic people."[2] What Vatican II taught is that this is the primary truth about the Church and the perspective in which all aspects of the Church, including authority and hierarchy,[3] must be seen.[4]

[1] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* Series 3, Vol. 5, 847ff.

[2] *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church,* Chapter II, Art. 9.

[3] *Ibid.,* Chapter III, Art. 18.

[4] In this perspective it becomes immediately evident, for example, that laymen are not fundamentally passive recipients in relation to priests, bishops and pope; rather, they are "sharers in the priestly, prophetic and kingly functions of Christ," and "they carry out their own part in the mission of the whole Christian people with respect to the Church and the world" (*Ibid.,* Chapter IV, Art. 31).

According to the Council, then, the Church is not to be seen in a perspective of authority, hierarchy, papal primacy or any other juridical aspect of the life of the Church. Rather, the Church is to be understood as people, the total community of people chosen and called together by God himself and "sent forth into the whole world as the light of the world and the salt of the earth."[5] Thus, the tendency to think of 'the real Church' as the members of the hierarchy, frequently operative in the past and even in the present, has been vanquished in principle by Vatican II.

Pope Paul

If Pope Paul was right in stating that the Church needs to transform its understanding of itself, and if the Council in response did anything more than simply repeat the notion of the Church which was generally taught and learned and operative before the Council, then members of the Society have the duty to re-think and transform in an analogous way their understanding of what the Society is in the Church and what communities are in the Society. If the reason why the self-understanding of the Church needed reform by the Council is that the operative and official concept of the Church was excessively juridical and insufficiently theological, Jesuits must expect that the perspective in which we have been accustomed to see the Society and the community life of the Society suffers from the same deficiency. Jesuits must expect also that, if the operative notion of religious community has been inadequate, this inadequacy has affected our thinking concerning all aspects of community life (relations between superiors and other members, authority, initiative, leadership, obedience, religious discipline, daily order, etc.), and that, consequently, all these things fall within the field of what must be rethought and adapted to a new self-understanding of the Church.

A legalistic or excessively juridical approach to community life has as its starting point a juridical fact. Religious community is defined, for example, as a group of religious under the authority of a religious superior. A theological approach to community life, on the other hand, has as its starting point a consideration of realities which can never be fully externalized and are, therefore, not directly susceptible of or controllable by juridical regulation. Specifi-

[5] *Ibid.*, Chapter II, Art. 9.

cally, the theological approach sees religious community primarily in terms of mysterious realities which are the gratuitous gifts of the mystery called God:[6] the gifts of Christian faith and charity. This approach is demonstrated by the 31st General Congregation, when it stated:

> The principal bond of community life is love, by which our Lord and those to whom He has entrusted His mission of salvation are loved in a single act. By this love which contains a real offering of one's self to others, a true brotherhood in the Lord is formed, which constantly finds human expression in personal relationships and mutual regard, service, trust, counsel, edification, and encouragement of every kind.[7]

While legalism, beginning with the concept of authority and defining community life then in relation to this concept, sees community primarily in terms of a distinction between the religious superior and other members, theology understands community primarily, not in terms of any distinction among members, but in terms of the ultimate, mysterious unity of all, which constitutes the very essence of Christian community and from which must flow the authentic meaning of all aspects of religious life, including the distinction between superior and other members.

---

[6] While this paper was being written, the following appeared in a press release: "Pope Paul VI has urged Catholic intellectuals to purge the common idea of God of its oversimilarity to man himself and thus counter a growing atheism. . . . The Pope was speaking Aug. 29 to university graduates. . . . Asking what can counteract atheism, he said 'first of all to plumb and to purify the concept, often childish and anthropomorphic, that we have made of God, in order to restore it to its sublime transcendence, to its sovereign otherness, to its extremely delicate communicability'" (*The Tidings, 9/8/67*). This address has special significance for Jesuits, on whom Pope Paul seems according to his allocution to the General Congregation to rely mainly in counteracting the growth of atheism. In light of this present address it would seem that Jesuits have a duty to rethink their operative concept of God. If it is found to be inadequate, this inadequacy will have affected, obviously, our idea of how we are to serve him in community life. But Pope Paul is saying that an inadequate operative notion of God is, moreover, a cause of contemporary atheism.

[7] *Documents of the 31st General Congregation,* Decree 19, No. 5 *a.* Similarly, a theological approach is present also in the consensus paper on community life of the Assistancy Conference: "Christ's prayer for those whom He loves is that they be one as He and His Father are one. The bond of this unity is to be their love for one another responding to the love which comes to them from the Father through Christ His Son. In the Society of

What follows now is an attempt to illustrate some of the differences in consequences to which the two approaches lead.

1) If religious community is conceived primarily as religious subjects under the authority of a superior, the essence of community is that, while all other members are essentially alike and together, one member, the superior, is essentially set apart and distinguished from the rest. If this prevails as the operative notion of what religious community is, it is assumed quite logically that the superior has privileges not shared by the rest of the community and one form of behavior is proper for the superior and another form proper for all other members of the community. For example, it is logically inferred that the superior should have a special place in the dining room: this is a proper way for the superior to live in community, whereas it would be improper for any other member of the community to live in this way.

When, however, a theological concept of community life is taken as the starting point for considerations of how community life should be lived, as was done by the Assistancy Conference, the logical conclusion concerning the superior's place in the dining-room is the exact opposite: "Let him throw away the napkin ring!"[8] This conclusion could be expanded: let the superior separate himself from all that the napkin ring symbolizes, all that reflects more the spirit of a by-gone form of secular government than the spirit of the Gospel.

In addition to the respect and love due to every community member as a person and a fellow Jesuit something special is, of course, due to the superior because of his office. It is by no means evident, however, that that something special is anything else besides obedience, in the Ignatian sense of the word. In fact, the spirit of the Gospel seems to direct those who hold authority in a Christian community toward a form of life which is diametrically opposed to special privilege or external honor in the community.[9]

2) If religious community is understood as being fundamentally a group of religious under a religious superior, a religious com-

---

Jesus this bond of love is the source, strength, and fruit of our community life." (*Consensus Positions and Recommendations,* C66.)

[8] *Consensus Positions and Recommendations,* C34.

[9] Cf., e.g., Jn. 13:2-17; Mt. 20:20-28; John L. McKenzie, *Authority in the Church, passim.*

munity can be seen to be too large only when there are too many subjects for one superior to govern. In a juridical perspective it is quite logical that the only relevant consideration in determining the size of a community is the relation of the subjects to the authority of the superior.

Size of community

In a theological perspective of community life it is immediately apparent that the question of how many Jesuits can be correctly governed by one superior is neither the only nor the most important factor in evaluating the size of a religious community. It is signficant in this regard that the question of government is only the third of three reasons given by the General Congregation for their concern "that the number of scholastics in the houses of formation be not too large."[10] Similarly significant is that, of the four reasons given by the Assistancy Conference for its recommendation "that serious and diversified experimentation be done in dividing large communities into small communities or sub-communities," none is that communities at present are too large to be governed by one superior.[11]

3) If religious community is understood basically as a group of religious under the authority of a religious superior, then those things in the life of a religious which are susceptible of regulation by the superior's authority receive primary attention in considerations of community life. And what is susceptible of regulation by authority is completely external; it is not personal interiority. Thus, community life comes to mean essentially a conformity in external matters, a uniformity with regard to what is used or possessed and with regard to doing things (common exercises). Community life is identified with common life, *vita communis*, which the *Epitome*, relying on the Code of Canon Law, defines as follows:

In Societate . . . vita communis ita intellegi debet: 1° Quod ad victum, vestitum et cetera vitae necessaria, retineatur uniformitas tam Superiorum cum inferioribus, quam inferiorum inter se; si quid vero peculiare ob infirmam valetudinem aliamve iustam causam alicui necessarium iudicetur, id vitae communi minime repugnat.[12]

---

[10] Decree 9, No. 9.

[11] Op. cit., C67*f*.

[12] *Epitome Instituti Societatis Iesu*, 497, §2. It is indicative of the progress

As soon as external conformity becomes the focal center of community life, two things follow automatically: (a) there develops a tendency to regard uniformity in a religious community as an end in itself, as a self-validating value;[13] and (b) this absolutizing and mythologizing of uniformity creates the desire to regulate into uniformity all that can possibly be so regulated. Rules proliferate, extending into every nook and cranny of Jesuit life, as those who hold authority, conceiving their duty toward community life as a duty to regulate it into maximum uniformity, become preoccupied with such questions as when American Jesuits may eat butter and how they may wear their overcoats.[14]

Such regulations are, of course, ignored today. But simply ignoring some regulations and pretending that they do not and never did exist is hardly the most intelligent service which Jesuits can give to the Church and the world. What is needed is insight into

---

made by the 31st General Congregation that it presented a decree on "vita communitaria" (*De vita communitaria et de disciplina religiosa*). Although the term "vita communitaria" is understood by the Congregation as designating something fundamental in the Society and very different from what is termed by the *Epitome* "vita communis," nevertheless it does not appear in the latter. The closest approximations there seem to be "unio animorum" and "unio personarum". Yet, there is still a vast difference between what the *Epitome* understands by these last two terms (702-729) and what the Congregation is teaching in Decree 19, especially in No. 5. The mentality which produced an *Epitome* which considers thematically "vita communis" but not "vita communitaria" is undeniably different from that of a General Congregation which considers "vita communis" explicitly only within the larger, theological context of "vita communitaria" (Decree 19, No. 6 *d*).

[13] Legalism regards unity as identical with uniformity, external conformity. Faith sees unity as "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace: one body and one Spirit, even as you were called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one Baptism; one God and Father of all. . ." (Eph. 4:3ff.) In the Christian community it is of no essential importance whether there is external sameness or not: "There is neither Jew nor Greek; there is neither slave nor freeman; there is neither male nor female. For you are all one in Christ Jesus." (Gal. 3:28.) It is Christ who radically relativized any oneness whatsoever which is based on something purely external; the only oneness which matters absolutely in Christianity is "the unity of the Spirit". All humanly designed conformity is subject to the "tantum-quantum" rule of St. Ignatius and, therefore, to change.

[14] Cf. *Custom Book of the American Assistancy; Memoriale* of the last American Visitation.

the premises from which these regulations are derived as practical conclusions. If the conclusions seem not only ludicrous but also unchristian, inasmuch as they appear completely alien to the Pauline notion of the freedom which the Christian has in Christ and seem to be concerns diametrically opposed to those of the New Testament, it is because the premises, the starting points, are in aberration from genuine theological understanding of the Church and religious communities. The problem of such regulations is only a derivative problem; it will not be solved definitively until the root problem is solved.[15]

4) If religious community is understood primarily as a group of religious under the authority of a superior, communities will have a built-in tendency to split into two classes, which rarely associate easily with one another: administrators and non-administrators, those who hold some office and those who do not. If community is understood from the start in terms of a difference (community is where one religious has authority and the others are subject to it) instead of in terms of a fundamental unity, authority can readily become in practice something that divides certain members off from the other members of the community.

When communities tend to divide into these two general groups, across whose boundaries "personal relationships and mutual regard, service, trust, counsel, edification, and encouragement of every

[15] Within a perspective which regards community life primarily as a group of religious under a superior and consequently tends to identify community life with common life, it is quite logical that all rectors and ministers of scholastics who teach in high schools meet together, after the General Congregation proposed "liberal use of the principle of subsidiarity" (Decree 17, No. 7), to establish common regulations for all the scholastics. On the other hand, within a perspective which regards community life primarily as it is seen in Decree 19 it is equally logical to present to the California Province Conference, as the regents have done, the following recommendations:

"That the Rector, with his community, should be able to determine the domestic policies which meet that community's individual needs. Community needs are most often individual, therefore complete uniformity between [sic] communities seems neither important, possible, nor even desirable. Each community is or should be unique. . .

"That house regulations be drawn up by and for the community as a whole and that those things which tend to constitute the scholastics as a separate community-within-the-community be abolished. . ." (*Recommendations of the California Regents* offered for the forthcoming Province Conference, 4*f*.)

kind"[16] flow less readily and easily than within the boundaries of either group, something has gone radically wrong with the function of authority in the religious community. The purpose of such authority is unity, not division. But as long as a juridical concept of religious community is operative, authority must necessarily be more divisive than unitive in the work of creating genuine Christian community.[17]

5) If religious community is understood primarily as a group of religious under a superior, this leads to thinking in categories of "superiors" and "inferiors" or "subjects," there is a natural tendency built into the community toward failure with regard to the com-

[16] Decree 19, No. 5 *a*.

[17] An excessively juridical conception of community life can be seen in the *Epitome*, for example, in the text on "vita communis" already cited: "Quod ad victum, vestitum et certera vitae necessaria, retineatur uniformitas tam Superiorum cum inferioribus, quam inferiorum inter se. . . ." The uniformity to be maintained is one "of superiors with inferiors and of inferiors among themselves." A much more obvious, facile and direct way to speak of this uniformity is to refer simply to a uniformity among all members—much more obvious, that is, unless one understands community primarily as a group of religious subjects under a superior.

Also noteworthy, apropos of this not untypical passage, is an evident and immediate danger which exists when community is conceived primarily in terms of a difference between two classes. Without further ado the two classes can be designated as "superiores" and "inferiores", despite the fact that this terminology implies that the distinction between those who have authority in the Society and those who do not is a distinction, at least, between first-class and second-class members. (Is it also significant that the word "Superiorum" is capitalized in the text, and "inferioribus" is not?) Fortunately, the term "inferiores" is dead (a logical tendency to kill the correlative term "superiores" and to replace it with "officers" can be noticed in contemporary writings). Similarly, the term "subditi," "subjects," derived apparently from long-gone political orders rather than from the New Testament, is on the wane, as is evidenced, for example, by the decrees of the General Congregation. Whereas a legalistic conception of community expresses itself in the language of the *Epitome*, a theological view of community spontaneously finds a new language. (Cf., e.g., Decree 17, Nos. 3, 6, 7, 8: "fratres sui", "sodales".)

The Assistancy Conference considered "community" a subject important enough to merit a consensus paper (*op. cit.*, C66*ff.*). Significantly, the paper not only does not use the words "superior" or "subject"; it is totally concerned about matters which have nothing to do with the distinction between those who have authority and those who do not. It would not be easy to find another official document on community which has achieved this feat!

munication proper to a religious community. It is much more natural for a "superior" to feel that he should simply tell "inferiors" or "subjects" what they should do than to feel that he should consult them, perhaps learning with them or even from them what should be done. And it is much more natural that a "superior" feel that he alone needs to know the most important plans and other matters than that he feel that such things are of concern to "inferiors" and should be communicated to "subjects." Dialogue, "fraternal gatherings" to "promote a common seeking of God's will" (such as the California Province Conference), are seen as an essential aspect[18] of community life only after a theological perspective of community life has replaced a juridical perspective, as occurred at the General Congregation.

6) When religious community is understood primarily as a group of religious under a superior, religious communities can be totally insensitive toward certain expressions of uncharity which violate the very heart of Christian community. If community is understood from the start as divided into two ranks, superior and subjects, division into various classes within the community will appear to be a natural thing. It will be taken for granted that brothers, scholastics and fathers as three ranks of a hierarchy are assigned the worst, the second best and the best places, respectively, in the dining-room, in recreational facilities and in the chapel. Even the public reading of scriptural passages such as Jn. 13:1-17 in dining-room and chapel did not awaken a sense of incongruity between what was being heard and what was being lived. In like manner, the impersonal and, therefore, uncharitable relations necessitated by fidelity to the rule of grades never seemed to be anything other than a means to religious perfection. It is, then, indicative of progress both in theology and, more importantly, in Christian living when the General Congregation states: "Priests, brothers, and scholastics should all associate with one another easily, in sincerity, *evangelical simplicity,* and courtesy, as is appropriate for a real family gathered together in the name of the Lord."[19]

---

[18] Decree 8, No. 5. "Fraternal gatherings" is enumerated with "the account of conscience to superiors" and "conversation with the spiritual father."

[19] Decree 19, No. 7 *c.*, emphasis added. Cf. also the recommendations of the Assistancy Conference:

"Our communities should be true homes in which all members, priests,

7) If community life is conceived juridically as a number of religious under the authority of a superior, the criteria used in evaluating the aptness of candidates for the Society, for vows, for the priesthood and for offices of authority are inevitably affected for the worse.

It is self-evident, of course, that for one whose conception of community is primarily juridical and not theological, the criteria by which he judges the aptness for Jesuit community life of an individual will be primarily juridical rather than theological. Concretely, this will mean that, since Jesuit community is a number of Jesuits under a superior, the fulfillment of this relations of Jesuits to a superior, i.e. obedience, will be the primary requisite for life in a Jesuit community. Logically, then, the novice who always does what he is told will be considered the ideal novice, provided that no great defects in other areas exist. Thus there is a tendency to see all other criteria, including charity,[20] as not only subordinate to obedience, but also as fundamentally negative criteria. And, of course, how the ideal novice is conceived will determine the way in which the living of novitiate life is structured.

---

scholastics, and brothers feel equally at home. . .

"Grades and divisions of any kind leading to social distinction or double standards in whatever area must not be tolerated" (*op. cit.*, C68).

[20] When obedience is understood as the primary virtue of community life, charity will be viewed, unconsciously, as subordinate to obedience: there will be a tendency to think of charity as a means for the maintaining of the order of community life which authority imposes. The theological virtue of charity, when subordinated to the moral virtue of obedience, has to be reduced to a moral virtue, e.g., courtesy or gentlemanliness, as in the following:

"The order of the day . . . is to be faithfully observed particularly in houses of training, having regard for: the interior spiritual life which is to be fostered even by external helps; charity, or responsibility for those conditions (caritatem, seu responsibilitatem erga eas condiciones) of silence, recollection, etc., which aid the work, quiet, and prayer of others. . ." (Decree 19, No. 8 *f.* Fortunately, this is a section of only secondary importance, "More Concrete Applications," and a different viewpoint predominates in the immediately preceding sections where the *fundamental principles* of community life are proposed.) It should be noted in this passage how charity is understood not only as a moral virtue subordinate to obedience but also negatively. Charity is courteously not disturbing others from fulfilling obediently the order of the day.

Novitiate

Just as a juridical conception of community life can render religious insensitive to essential violations of authentic Christian community, as indicated earlier, so the same conception can lead to a form of novitiate life which actually discourages authentic Christian community. Instead of fostering growth in the love and "true brotherhood in the Lord, which constantly finds human expression in personal relationships,"[21] the novitiate can directly impede the birth and growth of authentic personal relationships and directly promote unauthentic, artificial relations. For example, a formal way of addressing each other, creating artificiality and aloofness among them instead of the familiarity out of which grow authentic personal relationships and genuine love, has been the rule among novices.

As long as genuine personal relationships are positively discouraged among novices, there can be no way by which the capacity of a novice to form deep, authentic, mature personal relationships with the other members of his religious community is regarded as a criterion for evaluating his vocation. Evidently a juridical conception of community life leads to creating a kind of novitiate in which something understood by the General Congregation as pertaining to the very essence of the Jesuit vocation can be neither adequately tested nor evaluated before the novice is allowed to become a member of the Society.[22]

The germ of a significant reform in this regard is indicated in the extensive concern of the General Congregation with the question of affective maturity,[23] a concern which appears obviously

---

[21] Decree 19, No. 5 *a*.

[22] Since Christian charity, understood correctly as a theological and not a moral virtue, as well as psychological problems, inasmuch as they involve an inability to relate genuinely to other people, both have something to do with a person's capacity for deep personal relationships, it is understandable that, if novices are not allowed to develop authentic personal relationships and their vocation is not evaluated precisely with regard to their capacity to form such relationships with fellow-novices and Jesuits, it can easily happen that, very shortly after he has made his vows and is placed in circumstances different from those of the novitiate, a Jesuit will manifest long-standing but previously undetected serious psychological problems.

[23] Decree 8, Nos. 6, 7, 13, 17, 18, 22-26, 36, 39; Decree 9, Nos. 5-9; Decree 19, Nos. 8 *c*, 11, 12. Cf. also the paper of the Assistancy Conference on "Psychological Development" (*op. cit.*, C29*ff.*).

fundamental within a genuinely theological perspective of religious community.

8) If religious community is conceived fundamentally as a number of religious under the authority of a superior, and if, as shown already, this leads to thinking of the obedience of religious to the authority of their superior as the fundamental virtue and activity of a religious community, then "doing the will of God" must eventually come to be understood as synonymous with doing the will of the religious superior (and discovering the will of God will become identified with discovering what the superior wants). In such a context of initiative on the part of the religious must be understood as something, at best, superfluous and, at worst, suspect and to be discouraged. And if initiative on the part of religious is not positively encouraged, it is hardly possible that talents of leadership will be developed.

Progress was made in the area by the General Congregation when it explicitly recognized that finding out the will of God is not synonymous with discovering the will of the superior, but a much broader reality, and then consequently affirmed explicitly the need to cultivate initiative. In the words of the Congregation, the "divine will is concretely revealed to us especially by the inner promptings of grace and the direction of superiors, as well as by the example of our brothers, the demands of our apostolic work, common life, and rules and contingencies of our own life and the spiritual needs of our time. This objective is unattainable apart from the constant cultivation of a spirit of initiative and responsibility within obedience. . . ."[24] When doing the will of God is equated simply with obedience to religious authority, obedience is absolutized and mythologized and the very essence of Christian life is misunderstood. Obedience becomes an end in itself because for the religious doing the will of God is an end in itself. *What* the superior commands, provided it is not sinful, becomes more or less irrelevant; and it seems that obeying a command to plant cabbages upside-down is doing the will of God in just the same way as obeying a command to plant cabbages right-side-up.

[24] Decree 8, No. 7. There might be recalled in this context the emphasis placed by St. Ignatius, at the very beginning of his Constitutions, on "interna caritatis et amoris illius lex quam Sanctus Spiritus scribere et in cordibus imprimere solet" in relation to "ullae externae Constitutiones."

Since to obey the will of the superior for the love of God is exactly synonymous with doing the will of God for the love of God, a religious need not concern himself about whether he is ordered to water a dry stick or the garden-patch. What happens in the world, what gets done or what does not get done, becomes a matter of indifference to the religious, since only the superior has any positive responsibility for this, while all other religious have only the negative responsibility of not obeying when sin is commanded. The *unum necessarium* for the religious is to obey without sinning.

Religious authority becomes a self-validating reality: whatever the superior commands (sin excepted) is automatically the will of God simply because the superior has religious authority, i.e. power from God, and that is all there is to it. Thus, religious authority is conceived mythically as a magic power: the superior has some esoteric, inexplicable capacity for determining what the mysterious, unpredictable will of God is (concerning, for example, how the cabbages are to go into the ground today), and this capacity is designated gnostically as "the grace of state."[25]

When, on the other hand, obedience is understood within a theological context of religious community, there is no tendency to absolutize and mythologize it. Religious obedience is vowed not because it magically turns anything it touches into the will of God, but because it is seen as a practical means toward an absolute end, the will of God, which is not just anything at all, but something very definite which God himself has publicly revealed to his

[25] Since the concept of the 'grace of state' seems to derive more from magic and gnosticism than from fact and theology, it is understandable that this concept, inasmuch as it implies anything different from or more than what is understood by a theology of actual graces offered to *all men* and of charisms breathed where *the Spirit* wills, not only leaves unexplained but also renders unintelligible certain obvious facts, e.g.: (a) that since the days of Peter, Paul and Judas religious authority has sometimes been exercised well and sometimes poorly, has sometimes succeeded and sometimes failed utterly; (b) that it has not infrequently happened in the history of the Church that someone holding a position of authority has had to be removed from office, not necessarily because of sins, but simply because of incompetence in the exercise of his office; and (c) that, before anyone is appointed to an office of religious authority, there is ordinarily extensive investigation made precisely to ascertain that the individual under consideration does indeed *already* possess the qualities requisite for the competent fulfillment of the office.

people. The General Congregation affirms the relative character of obedience as a means in relation to an end, an absolute, the will of God publicly revealed by himself, in these words: ". . . Through the vow of obedience our Society becomes a more fit instrument of Christ in his Church, unto the assistance of souls for God's greater glory."[26] The work cut out for Christ in his Church and revealed publicly by God as the work *he* wants carried out in this world is called by the Congregation "the assistance of souls,"[27] and obedience is understood as a reasonable, not magical, way to accomplish this work. And it is precisely because obedience was seen in this way that it was introduced by Ignatius and his first companions into the Society in the first place.[28]

If, then, doing the will of God is understood, not legalistically as identical with obeying religious authority, but theologically in a context of faith as using intelligent means and taking reasonable steps to accomplish the work that God himself in Christ has assigned to his People, then (a) "the direction of superiors" is clearly seen as only one of many ways to discover what the will of God is "concretely";[29] (b) the need for "fraternal gatherings" to "promote a common seeking of God's will" becomes apparent;[30] and (c) it becomes also evident that, "since all who work together in God's service are under the influence of the Holy Spirit and his grace, it will be well in the Lord to use their ideas and advice so as to understand God's will better," and that, consequently, "Superiors in the Society should readily and often ask for and listen to the counsel of their brethren. . . ."[31]

---

[26] Decree 17, No. 2.

[27] The term "the assistance of souls" (*auxilium animarum*), derived more from scholastic philosophy than from the New Testament, is unfortunate. Repeatedly Vatican II clarified what the mission of Christ in His Church is, speaking of it always in ways which directly reflect the message of the New Testament and not the filters of philosophy. Cf., e.g., *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*, Nos. 24, 45, 93; *Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity*, No. 2.

[28] Cf. Decree 19, No. 1.

[29] Decree 8, No. 7.

[30] Decree 8, No. 5.

[31] Decree 17, No. 6. Such conclusions of the General Congregation concerning how the will of God can be found represent the logical result of a demythologizing of obedience, which a decade ago Karl Rahner recognized as a need:

". . . Obedience in religious life is not the obedience of children. There-

Limits to obedience

When religious obedience has been absolutized by the legalistic mentality, it is natural that obedience then is expected to be found everywhere, even in areas where it cannot possibly exist. If, however, obedience is not absolutized, it is self-evident that there are limits to religious obedience and that the fundamental limitations is that it can exist only vis-à-vis religious authority. Religious obedience can exist only as a response to the exercising of an office of religious authority, and such authority exists only in religious communities.

The Assistancy Conference has called attention to the fact that "it is characteristically Jesuit to be simultaneously a member of a number of communities. Our vocation is to serve, foster, and even create communities which interlock with the Jesuit community through our presence."[32] Since the Society does not exist for itself

---

fore, the religious superior should not play the role of an Olympian papa. . . The superior should not try to give the impression that he stands under the immediate inspiration of the Holy Ghost, but should be courageous enough to seek approval for his commands by giving reasons for them. It is incomprehensible how such an approach to mature and much-loved brothers and sisters in the Lord should be a threat to the authority of the superior, who, according to the command of Christ, should see in the authority of his office only the greater obligation to serve. . . . It is not true, even in religious communities, that all initiative should take its rise from superiors. . . One frequently gets the impression, both in religious orders and in the Church in general, that initiative, action, militancy (*Initiative, Einsatz, Offensive*), and the like, are indeed considered necessary and desirable in subjects, but only on condition that the go-signal be given 'from above', and only in the direction which has already been unequivocally and authoritatively determined by superiors. . ." ("A Basic Ignatian Concept. Some Reflections on Obedience" in: WOODSTOCK LETTERS, 86 (1957), 293ff.

If, however, improvements in theology and operative religious notions can only through education (and for some this will mean re-education) come into existence, it is understandable that ten years after the article just cited was published in English translation the Assistancy Conference feels that still "urgently needed is an up-dated theology of authority and obedience in response to the workings of the Spirit among the people of God today, a theology of special relevance to the place of the members of the Jesuit community and of participative decision-making in seeking and finding the will of God in the policies and choices of the Society and their implementation by individual superiors" (*op. cit.*, C39).

[32] *Op. cit.*, C67.

but in order to further the mission of the Church, the Society exists, obviously, to serve others besides its own members. Involvement, membership, beyond the Jesuit religious community in other, non-Jesuit communities, formally organized or informal, is therefore essential to the fulfillment of the Jesuit vocation.

Since its origin the Society has regarded schools, educational communities, as communities pre-eminently suited for furthering the mission of the Church through the involvement of Jesuits. Historical circumstances (always subject to change) directed Jesuits to take alone (rather than with other religious, diocesan priests and/or laymen) the initiative to bring into existence new educational communities (rather than participate in such communities already existing). This initiative entailed on the part of Jesuits financial expenditures for the necessary physical facilities of the educational community, the making available of themselves for all teaching and administrative offices of the community, and the inviting and accepting of boys or young men to complete as students the membership and constituting of educational communities. Thus, a way was found by which many Jesuits would fulfill their vocation of furthering the mission of the Church by involvement in communities outside the Jesuit community, i.e. in the non-Jesuit communities commonly designated as "Jesuit schools."

A Jesuit school is not a Jesuit community. A Jesuit community is a community of religious of the Society of Jesus, and its common purpose is the living of Jesuit religious life. A non-Jesuit community is any other community in the world, and its common purpose can be anything else besides the living of Jesuit religious life. It is the latter category which includes "Jesuit schools."[33]

[33] With regard to *non-Jesuit* communities, which Jesuits in fulfilling their vocation join: (a) they may or may not have Jesuits (one, some, even many) as members; (b) they may or may not have been created by the initiative and financial expenditures of only Jesuits; (c) they may or may not have Jesuits as (one of, some of, many of, all) their officers; (d) they may or may not have as major officers men who are Jesuits holding also major offices in their religious communities; (e) they may or may not have names associated with the Society of Jesus (e.g. Jesuit High School); (f) they may or may not use in the pursuit of their purposes property and facilities on which the home of a Jesuit community is also located; (g) they may or may not use property and facilities owned legally exclusively by the Society of Jesus; and (h) they may or may not have legal arrangements by which Jesuit

Authority exists for community; community does not exist for authority. Authority is a function of community, and the kind of community specifies the kind of authority. Religious authority can exist only in a religious community, and other authority can exist only in another community. Since Jesuit schools are not Jesuit religious communities, authority in these schools is not Jesuit religious authority. And since religious obedience can exist only as a response to religious authority, no Jesuit should attempt to see obedience to authority in Jesuit schools as Jesuit religious obedience. It is just as much and just as little Jesuit obedience as is obedience to the civil authority of the civic community in which the Jesuit school is located. This does not mean that Jesuits in Jesuit schools should be rebels; it means simply that they should know what they are doing.

Religious obedience, however, is involved indirectly in both obedience to authority in a Jesuit school and obedience to civil authority in the civic community. When a religious superior assigns a Jesuit as his apostolate a position outside the Jesuit religious community, and in a non-Jesuit, educational community, he is *ipso facto* assigning the Jesuit to fulfill *all* the duties which having that position in the non-Jesuit, educational community (and also in the wider civic community) will entail. The superior is *ipso facto* assigning with religious authority a Jesuit to fulfill all duties of membership in non-Jesuit communities, because it would be immoral to neglect some duties (moral or Christian obligations) of membership in non-Jesuit communities. Some of these duties can be foreseen by the superior; he knows, for instance, in assigning a Jesuit to teach in a school, that the Jesuit has the duty to teach.

---

superiors can by religious authority assign Jesuits directly into these communities. Whatever the case may be in all these matters, non-Jesuit communities remain non-Jesuit communities. This fact is, of course, becoming increasingly recognized. And this for many reasons. But one worth being stated in the present context is the fact that, since some Jesuit communities have already been, or are now considering the possibility of being, incorporated as legal entities distinct from the legal entities of the educational communities in which most of their members are involved, it is obviously becoming impossible for even a person who understands community in a legalistic way to ignore the distinction between the Jesuit religious community and the non-Jesuit educational community and to regard in practice the latter as either identical with or an extension of the former.

Some of the duties no one can foresee because they depend on circumstances; no one knows when a Jesuit is assigned as a teacher in a school whether or not he will have the duty of putting a tourniquet on a student's arm, because this depends on what circumstances arise. Teaching class at the time assigned by the principal of a high school is neither more nor less religious obedience than putting a tourniquet on a student's arm when need arises. Both are indirectly religious obedience inasmuch as they are the fulfillment of duties incumbent on a Jesuit by his membership and/or position in the non-Jesuit, educational community to which religious authority has assigned him. Only when legalistic thinking absolutizes authority does "duty" appear to be a synonym for "obeying the orders of authority." When authority is seen, on the other hand, as existing for community, then community, not authority, can be understood clearly as the primary source of duty: duties are duties toward those with whom one lives, and authority exists to further the fulfillment of these duties. All duties toward authority are therefore derivative from duties toward communities.

Therefore, if a Jesuit is assigned as a teacher into an educational community, whose *raison d'être* is, obviously, the education of its student members, his primary duty within the community is toward the education of students, not toward those who hold gubernatorial or administrative offices in the community. It is only because of his duty in the community toward the education of students that this Jesuit has any duty at all toward those who hold these offices, which exist only to make possible and to facilitate the education of students. If, therefore, there should ever arise a conflict of duties in this community, primary duties, here as everywhere else, take precedence over secondary duties. To decide otherwise would be immoral. In such a conflict, acting in accord with primary duty would be precisely the fulfillment in that situation of the apostolate which the Jesuit has accepted in religious obedience to his religious superior.

Justice

Membership in a community involves a *fundamental* duty and responsibility toward *all the community.* This means, at least, a real concern that justice prevail in all intra-community relations. Should an injustice occur toward any member, and should that

injustice originate with some who hold offices in the community, as happened recently at Catholic University, it is then a fundamental duty of all other members to see that justice is restored. It changes nothing in regard to this fundamental duty of membership in the community that most of the trustees in Washington, D.C., responsible for the injustice are also archbishops in various archdioceses throughout the nation. Moreover, since some of the faculty members who acted to restore justice in the community are secular priests, it is conceivable that a trustee who collaborated in the injustice is also the archbishop who with religious authority originally assigned one of the priests who resisted the injustice to Catholic University for his apostolate. This priest's protest against the injustice of the trustees would be, in this case, precisely the fulfillment of his duty derived from his religious obedience to his archbishop, whether the archbishop eventually realizes this or not. *Mutatis mutandis,* what has been said applies also to the notorious case of St. John's University.

It is, of course, very unfortunate that members of a religious order who have authority at St. John's University should be slower than others to recognize injustice and the misuse of authority. It is more unfortunate when this is the case with men who are archbishops in the Church. There is indeed some crisis of authority in the Church when religious who hold offices of authority and archbishops must be forced by others to reverse the injustice which their misuse of authority creates. Authority by its very nature should serve justice; something has gone radically wrong with the understanding of authority when it can proceed so easily into injustice without even recognizing where it is going. The crisis of authority is that a legalistic conception of authority inevitably creates injustice and insensitivity to the injustice created, while contemporary man becomes more and more concerned about both justice and charity. If authority is being undermined in the Church today, the evidence seems to show that it is being undermined through the public scandal given to the world by those who exercise authority as if it were absolute.

It matters both within our Jesuit communities and within the other communities into which our apostolate takes us whether our notion of religious community is legalistic or theological.

THE JESUIT COMMUNITY AS A COMMUNITY OF SERVICE

Felix F. Cardegna, S.J.

a rector's view

It is with a certain degree of frustration that I launch into a discussion of the relationship between community and apostolate in the Society of Jesus. One has the feeling that we have said all that there is to say about the thing. It was one of the fundamental issues underlying the decrees of the 31st General Congregation. The fathers of the Congregation were divided on a number of key issues, and I think this was one of them. From the viewpoint of my particular bias, the good guys in this case were those who opted for the primacy of apostolate over community. Actually, I think this is the view which prevailed in the Congregation. If there is one word which characterizes the 31st General Congregation and its decrees, it is the word "apostolic". Not only are the largest number of chapters concerned with the apostolate, but most of the other chapters, e.g. the chapters on prayer and each of the vows, as well as the one on community life itself, are permeated with an apostolic orientation. It seems to me that there were two basic mentalities among the fathers of the Congregation with respect to this question. There were those who felt that the Society must seriously and urgently examine its apostolates, with a view to dropping some, revitalizing others, and entering upon new ones; and that community life within very broad limits is to be tailored to these new and renewed apostolates. These men would in general be more open to

change in community patterns and style of life, principally in order to further apostolic effectiveness, but not exclusively for this reason. The other mentality opted for a closer adherence to the concrete patterns of community life with its regimen of prayer, Mass, other spiritual duties, community exercises and practices, such as they have experienced in their lifetime as Jesuits and which have been spelled out in laws, rules or customs. To these men, this style of community life is a very large factor in what makes a man into a Jesuit, gives him the Jesuit style, passes on to him the Jesuit spirit. One cannot break up this pattern too drastically without threatening the unity of the Society and Jesuit community. Apostolates which are radically at odds with such a style of life,—if there are any—would in effect be beyond the scope of the Society.

I have already said that I favor the first view, which places apostolate in the place of preeminence. However, I should point out immediately that I do not think that by doing this I am reducing community to a means. For, as I see it, the comparison here is not between the values of apostolate and community as such, but between apostolate and a concrete set of details which define a particular pattern and style of community life,—one form of community life. Outside of some very general factors, I think it is an illusion to look for one style of community life which can be called Jesuit; just as I think it is an illusion to look for a Jesuit religious discipline beyond obedience and the manifestation of conscience. This is one of the unique things about us. We do not go in for minutiae. We are, or should be, free, flexible, and large-minded. And I think there is a *de facto* proof of this absence of one particularized form of community life. Just look at the differences in daily living in a university or college community, a retreat house, a high school community, a parish, a house of writers, a philosophate, a mission station out in the bush, a labor school, a theologate, a novitiate,—not to mention that archetype of them all—the provincialate.

I once heard an older father complaining about the style of life in a provincialate. He thought it was such a rigid, artificial, constricting, isolated kind of living. He once asked why they live that way. He was told that it was because the provincialate had to give good example. To which he replied, "To whom are we giving good

example,—the novices? It seems to me that the only other place in the province that lives like this is the novitiate, and now not even the novices live this way." The provincialate, like every other house, should have a style of its own. There is a tremendous variety *de facto* in the various houses of any province. Extend this to the entire Society all over the world in so many different countries and cultures,—and I doubt that we need to be concerned about the breakdown of unity or community due to diversity, very great diversity, in the concrete style of community living. We have been living in this diversity for centuries—and thank God for it. In fact, I doubt that we have *de facto* ever lived any other way.

To sum up, in the option between apostolate and a somewhat detailed description of a particular style of community life, I think the preeminence has to be given to apostolate. I suspect that this was the general framework in which the question was posed among the fathers of the 31st General Congregation and, by and large, the good guys won out.

Santa Clara

Then I went to Santa Clara and after about six or seven days of dialogue, one day we got launched into a full-fledged discussion of the relationship between community and apostolate. One of the scholastic delegates sparked the discussion by saying something to this effect: "The Ignatian notion of community put the main emphasis on the group of men gathered together to perform a work. In the Society today, in the Church, there is a notion of community which we could briefly say is this: A community is a group of men who love one another deeply and whose actions spring from this love. The two views could possibly be reconciled, but again there is the question of emphasis, which is very important. The first view seems to distort the Gospel notion of community so as to use it as a means to an end, and the second view would say, community is the important thing; our job is to build community in all forms" (Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 172-3).

This statement evoked a reaction, almost a cry of pain, from one of the weightier members of the conference, who had slugged his way through two sessions of the 31st General Congregation as one of the good guys described above. He said that they had shed blood, sweat and tears to establish the apostolic dimension as

more important than the monastic orientation of community for its own sake. He said he thought this was the progressive, the young mentality; and now he finds that the scholastics, the young men, want community first. He sounded as though he had been stabbed in the back. And then the succeeding discussion struggled hard to break out of a structuring of the argument which characterized the emphasis on community as monastic and the emphasis on apostolate as the General Motors approach, with the implicit demand that one choose between them.

A lot of good things were said in this discussion, and they can be found in Vol. 3, [Pt. 2], pp. 178-199. Here I think the relationship between community and apostolate was posed in different terms than above. Some of the points made were the following:

1. In the genesis of the Society, the original group of Jesuits started with an apostolic commitment which grew out of making the Spiritual Exercises. Then they decided to join a group to achieve their apostolic goals, rather than to pursue these goals as individuals. Then they decided on the structure of authority in the community they formed. So, there seems to have been a certain priority of apostolate over community, at least temporarily.

2. The concept of community was to St. Ignatius a joining together of companions in Christ. We come together with Christ in this particular community, and with one another. Then the community itself extends Christ in a particular way.

3. The concept of community in terms of the Church is really a relationship among persons and Christ. Being with Christ is sharing in his presence in the world. We speak of various modes of the manifestation of Christ in the world. From the New Testament point of view, a good case can be made for saying that the one thing which unifies these modes is that Christ is present in the community. One could go even further and say that the Christian community *is* the presence of Christ. Christ's presence in the world is Christian community as a dynamic concept that broadens itself constantly from the cell unit, whatever that may be, to a wider and wider dimension.

4. This brings us to an attractive possibility for the resolution of the tension between community and apostolate. Our mission, our only genuine apostolic purpose, is the fulfillment of Christ's mission.

Christ's mission is summed up in His priestly prayer for community at the Last Supper. "Let them all be one. Just as you, Father, are in union with me and I am with you, let them be in union with us, so that the world may believe that you sent me. I have given them the glory that you gave me, so that they may be perfectly unified and the world may recognize that you sent me and you love them just as you love me" (John 17, 21-23). The Christian mission is to create community in the human family as the People of God. To create community among men on all levels in my apostolate as a Christian.

This awareness of the apostolate of the Church being to create community has been restored to a kind of central position of eminence in recent years in the light of the Council and the thought connected with it. We have moved away from most of the institutionalized understanding of the Church and its apostolate to a more personalistic approach. Person exists only in community. If you look at it this way, the most important and basic apostolic task is the intensification of the life of the community itself which intends to be apostolic; and a most important Christian witness is to one another within this community; and only in terms of this deepening is a community capable of really bearing more effectively and more profoundly the presence of Christ to the world.

5. One of the things which a person achieves in community life in the Society, if it is authentic community life, is the ability to create other communities. He takes on not only the desire to create other communities, but in the process of living in community, he takes on those qualities which will enhance his ability to form other communities and he rubs off the sharp edges which will diminish this ability. The community really creates the power of creating other communities. You have a series of interlocking circles, all of which are united in a way in this Jesuit community in which we participate.

Participation

It is only by participation in many different communities that you can actualize the virtualities you have. The person develops in community, so that what has often been given as the description of the individual Christian is now being applied to this grouping of Christians or Jesuits. This grouping of Christians manifests to

the world in some way all the qualities such as openness and welcome and love which we claim to be characteristic of the Christian: that we help one another, and enable one another to do more than we would be able to do if we were isolated. The Christian wants to do things together because it is in the constant giving and receiving that we grow and become better persons and at the same time better apostles. What we are now groping for in this area is a person-centered community life. We are moving away from the kind of thinking which considers apostolic activity to be "doing something to someone"; and away from the structure-centered religious life which is imposed on everybody, to a person-centered religious life.

The fear that a lot of us have concerning the person-centered religious life is that it is open to a great deal of individual anarchy; everybody goes his own way and nobody is really concerned about what the group does. We need a profound faith and deep confidence in the value of the person and especially of the Christian person; that deep within him there is a movement outwards to others, and out of this orientation towards others comes a community. Community, therefore, emerges from the very meaning of person and especially a Christian person, rather than being imposed from outside. It is not something that has to be built into the person, but is rather an innate tendency which has simply to be set free to develop by removing obstacles that may be obstructing its development.

6. So while it is true that there is no explanation of why we have this particular community which we call the Society of Jesus except in terms of the apostolic goals that we as a group wish to accomplish, this may be conceived in too utilitarian a way. If you start out with a specific apostolic goal in mind and shape persons and community to it, you could very well reduce persons and community to means. But, if you have a broad apostolic purpose which is fundamentally to create community in the world and which urges you out into the world to meet people, to share the Christian presence, then the tension between apostolate and community may be a creative one. In this case, the community is created by apostolic effectiveness and apostolic effectiveness is there because of a certain strength of community.

So much from the Santa Clara conference. Next I would like to make reference to the Conference on the Spiritual Formation of Ours which was held in Rome during the first ten days of September. The impression I got upon arriving at the Conference was that we had been called together to help draw up some prescriptions which would constitute a follow-up on the decrees of the 31st General Congregation. Evidently Father General was receiving requests for more detailed directives to be given to the Society concerning the spiritual formation of Ours. A great deal of time was spent on novitiate and pre-novitiate programs. However, as you can see from Father General's Instruction "De Nostrorum Institutione in Spiritu", dated December 25 of last year, there was considerable preoccupation with the question of community life. The rectors of scholasticates who were there were asked to discuss and respond to a detailed list of questions submitted to them by Father General. Under the rubric of "our style of life", the following topics were listed: silence; fixed time for rising, retiring, prayer; visits to the Blessed Sacrament; obligation of attending classes; limits and norms for the use of television; our style of dress, inside and outside our houses; the problem of alcohol; smoking; our dealing with externs; visits to our relatives; visiting the city; social gatherings; movies; taking part in public demonstrations; and so on.

From the very outset there was a great deal of resistance in the group against universal prescriptions for the entire Society going into such detail. In fact, one group of rectors stayed on the larger questions of the role of the rector and the spiritual father; the re-education of rectors needed; the question of self-government in small communities of theologians; unity in the Society; the role of the general, etc.; and simply did not go into the details listed above. I mention this only to point out what appeared to me to be another manifestation of the two mentalities on this question. Among those who called the Conference, there were some whose approach was still to get a set of prescriptions which could then be applied throughout the Society; and this would reduce the uneasiness and the apparent disorder which seemed to prevail. They were concerned about the unity of the Society and, though in a genuinely mitigated way and with lots of consultation, were still basically using the way of uniformity to resolve the problem of unity. A large majority of the elected delegates at the Conference resisted

this approach and insisted on the principles of regionalism and subsidiarity. This applied especially to the area of our style of life, especially in the novitiate and houses of study. I do not think I heard anything new on the general question of the tension between community and apostolate, but I was extremely encouraged by the experimental stance which most of the delegates took with regard to the resolution of problems in this area. The experience of the Santa Clara and Roman Conferences was a great boost to my vocation in the Society.

Apostolic

In his Instruction of December 25, following up on the Roman Conference, Father General, in nos. 22 and 23, describes the community of the entire Society as apostolic and says that our community life takes its origin from our common apostolic vocation and it is not to be sought as an end for its own sake. The term or center where all our apostolic activities converge should be placed outside the ambit of community life and in the people whom we serve. The note or element of our "action" must be protected and promoted by the internal life of the community, which however is necessarily ordered according to the multiple exigencies of our apostolate. Community in the Society is dynamic. It is vivified by that presence of Christ which is promised in Matthew 18:20 to brothers gathered together in His name, and receives its peculiar strength for the apostolate from this presence of Christ. By it we are inserted into the universal mission of the Society.

The values of love, simple conversation and spontaneous communication drawn from the image of the family are proper to our community life. However the analogy of the family can be applied only with discretion to our life. Our houses and style of life are marked by their own adult, manly, religious, and apostolic character. If, even with mutual charity, we experience a certain psychological austerity, is not this a realistic experience of the sacrifice by which we renounced family life to devote ourselves completely to God and man?

The last event I attended in this saga of the relationship between community and apostolate was the Conference on Apostolic Community held at Spring Hill during this past Christmas week. Among other presentations, Fr. Fichter contributed a very stimulating

paper on the nature of community from a sociological point of view, with reference to the Society of Jesus. He approached community from a variety of angles, two of which may be of interest to us here. From the viewpoint of organization, i.e. as a social structure, a community may be typed as *gemeinschaft* (i.e. the smaller, communal, primary group) or *gesellschaft* (the larger, associational, secondary group). Fr. Fichter characterized the Society as the first breakthrough of a religious group into the gesellschaft structure, characterized by a rational, impersonal relationship and built on a rationality that gets things done. It is a voluntary grouping of professional colleagues and peers. Fr. Fichter then proposed the principle of instrumentalism, namely, that form follows function, or structure follows performance. If, therefore, certain communities are useful for our purpose, let us promote them to obtain our goals. If not, let us change them. The debate about small groups versus large groups is a reflection of an age-old problem of the tension between autonomy and dependence, personal freedom and institutional restraints, the balance of voluntary consensus and patterned restraints. Since one cannot escape institutions, the basic question is: what kind of people need what kind of structure to do what kind of things?

There was a certain amount of resistance to this approach which appeared to reduce community to a means in the pursuit of specific apostolic works. It did not seem to satisfy the expectations of many of the participants on the level of the human and Christian values of brotherhood and personal relationships.

So much for the history of the recent discussion on Jesuit community and apostolate. I shall now attempt a brief statement of matters as I see them. Community and apostolate are the twin poles of our Jesuit existence and are in some sense essential and necessary values of our way of life. Abstracting for the moment from particular styles of community life and forms of apostolate, I consider the values of community and apostolate as correlative; the relationship in the concrete being one of dynamic tension between these two poles of our life. On the broadest plane, it is possible to try to resolve this tension by saying that our apostolate *is* to create community on all levels in the human family, and this includes our own communities. But I do not think this resolves the

question of the relationship between our community life and our apostolates outwards, whether or not you characterize these as in some sense creating community in various areas of human existence. And this is the real problem. However, what this approach does do is to remind us of the importance of community in our lives, and it makes us at least hesitate to reduce community to the level of a sheer means to our apostolates.

In the view which makes community a means to the apostolate, there is a tendency to say that we decide what we want to do and then we tailor our style of community life to meet the demands of our apostolates. "Form follows function" is interpreted to mean that style of community life follows apostolic demands. If a certain style of community life is necessary or useful for our apostolic purposes, we promote this to achieve our apostolic goals. If not, we change the style to accomplish this. Within limits as to the extent to which one can stretch styles of living and still call them community life,—and I consider these limits rather broad,—I suppose one can structure his thinking about the relationship between community and apostolate in this framework. I think it is at least a working model that serves well in the practical order.

However, I have some difficulty with it. I hesitate to identify function with apostolate and form with community life, and then say that form follows function, i.e. community style of life follows apostolate. I think that both apostolate and community can be considered as functions and both must take concrete forms in relationship to their respective functions and also in relationship to the interdependence, interaction, and mutual influence of the two functions.

Community itself

The necessity of the apostolates in our lives is more than evident from all that has been said here at this Institute thus far. What is the necessity of community in itself? Human and Christian existence demand it of man. He is made for community. He becomes human, person and Christian only in community. A celibate religious especially, I think, needs his religious community in a special way, if he is to live humanly and as a Christian outside the community of married life. I take it as clear that his growth emotionally, intellectually, and spiritually are enhanced by community life, and

in some sense demand community life. I would conjecture that many of the losses from the priesthood into marriage are precipitated and aggravated by the absence of a community of concern for the individual priest in which his problems of loneliness would be reduced or at least gotten to in time. Community also assists a man in the discernment of spirits, makes it more reliable. It seems to me that discernment in serious matters can only be done in the context of the Christian community in which I live. Finally, it is the heart of the gospel message, to live in community, to build community, and the religious life is to provide an ideal for Christian living. For the moment, I prescind from the contribution to the apostolate which comes from a communal approach to our work. I am looking for the personal and religious rather than apostolic function of community. What I am trying to do is to establish the value and need for community life in its own right, though for a Jesuit never without reference to the apostolate as the co-essential element of his existence. Briefly, I am trying to avoid casting community simply in the role of a means to apostolates, even if a necessary one.

The position I have taken is some sort of middle position between the monastic approach which makes the community the essential value and apostolate secondary, and the associational approach which makes the apostolate the essential value and community secondary. Can we get a third kind of explanation which makes them correlative in importance? Would this be the sort of person-centered religious life we are groping for? Is it Jesuit?

Getting away from all the theorizing, I think there is a basic practical agreement on what we are looking for in all this. Maybe the theoretical discussion is getting in the way. What do we want of Jesuit community life? Practically, we want genuine personal human relationships with fellow Jesuits, friendships with them, just plain human living conditions, to be at home at home, just to live a human and Christian life. We want *these* as the basis of community. We do not want impersonal structures as the *basis* of community life, realizing always that some structure is necessary for any society. We also do not want a community to be turned in on itself in a state of constant, neurotic self-examination, a kind of navel-gazing sometimes referred to as seminary-itis. Our commu-

nities are apostolic and are to spring out of themselves and to be preoccupied with creating community outside of themselves in the world. I think this is basically what we want, and I would call such groups *person-centered communities of service.*

How do we go about getting them? Well, I am not sure of many things in this area except that we can only proceed through the instrumentalities of dialog and experimentation. The dialog is picking up and, in fact, I am beginning to get the feeling, where I come from at least, that we have just about talked ourselves out on this question. Just reviewing the material presented in this paper from various institutes, conferences, and meetings gave me the feeling that I have been through all this before, and more than once, and that there is very little left to be said, and we have got to *do* something now. All of which means we have got to move into the area of experimentation more boldly if for no other reason than to test what we have been saying and to find out what validity it has. Of course, I am not advocating just trying things indiscriminately. But we have set down the norms for serious experimentation elsewhere. And we have simply got to get some more content for the on-going dialog, some more substance to talk about. I get the feeling that we are beginning to go around in circles now with the talk. We need experiences, live attempts at solutions to our problems; to evaluate and either abandon, adopt, or change them.

This has been encouraged by the 31st General Congregation itself. Under the heading of *apostolate,* the Congregation came out strongly, as you know, for the re-evaluation of our ministries. Chapter 21, entitled "The Better Choice and Promotion of Ministries", and chapter 22, entitled "The Commission for Promoting the Better Choice of Ministries", are obvious enough proof of this. In the provinces I am most familiar with, Maryland and New York, these commissions are moving along rather well. The Sociological Survey or Province Self Study in some places is moving along and in others it seems to have vanished, gone into hibernation, or perhaps is re-grouping itself for another push forward.

Some of the questions put to me were: "How does the Society of Jesus serve the Church precisely as a religious community within the Church? What is the value of a community of service rather than one man working alone?" Well, I see a great deal of value both

to community and to apostolate from Jesuits working together in communities of service. Team work in the apostolate should not only improve the efficiency and the impact of our work but also strengthen the bonds of community among the men in such groups. The use of communal resources, i.e., not just physical facilities and equipment, but the pooled emotional, intellectual, spiritual and total personal resources of the members, it seems to me, would enhance both the work of the group and the personal development of the members in the group.

Broader terms

However, I would hasten to add a few comments to this basic response. When I speak of a community of service, I conceive this community apostolate or apostolic community in broader terms than what we might call our Jesuit institutional apostolates. This gets us into the much-discussed question of the ownership of our universities, colleges, and even other institutions, and the distinction which has often been made between control and influence. It is at least possible to carry on communal or corporate apostolates without ownership of institutions. This would be more evident in smaller team apostolates which we have always had to some degree or other in mission and retreat work, and which seems to be possible now in scholarly fields of professional specialization. My point is that we can distinguish the ownership of institutions as one form of community apostolate, but it does not exhaust the types of communal apostolates. Between the valuable large institutional apostolates and the individual apostolates, there is a whole range of team or communal apostolates.

What about the question of the so-called individual apostolates, where a man is working alone or as part of a non-Jesuit group, e.g. in a secular university or in a diocesan apostolic group? Well, I think we have always had men engaged in work like this in the Society; perhaps, some of our most famous men. I see no reason why we cannot continue to have both communal and individual apostolates. In fact, in this time of rapid and profound change, I would consider it important and even necessary to keep as many options open as possible as we search our way into the future. Individual apostolates are all the more acceptable if the men engaged in them are living in Jesuit communities. The General Con-

gregation mentions in the chapter on community life: "Our community life should likewise be improved by our common apostolic work. So we must promote the closest possible cooperation among Jesuits, by having all or very many in a community devoted to the same work—" We have already mentioned this advantage to community coming from a common apostolate. However, I think some diversity among the members of a community might not be bad for community life, and could perhaps even add a dimension to it. Sharing different experiences might very well be a source of vitality in a community, as long as the differing demands of the diverse apostolates do not pull the community apart in interests and opportunities for being together in moments when genuine communication and sharing can take place.

There is a more radical situation, however, which we should also mention. What about the man who not only works in an individual apostolate, but also lives outside the community? Is this in any sense acceptable, compatible with being a Jesuit? It must be, in some sense, since we have men in such situations, and perhaps always have had,—some rather famous. However if this situation were accepted as the normal occurrence, I would say that we have had it as a society. There are some who would say that this is the desirable goal for mature and competent formed fathers of the Society; that living in community is necessary in the earlier years of formation to absorb the spirit and tradition of the Society, to form one's Jesuit identity; but not after that. This is an illusion as far as I can see, and would result in the disintegration of the Society as a community of any kind. However, I can see the possibility of a certain number of our men living this way out of the practical necessities of a particular apostolic situation and for a limited length of time. In fact, we do have this to some degree with some of our men teaching in secular universities or among our military chaplains, to give but a few examples. And frequently enough these men develop a keen sense of their identity as Jesuits and a pride in the Society, I think, because they are forced by the circumstances in which they find themselves to articulate even to themselves what being a Jesuit really means. I also think that they develop a sort of homing-device which not only helps them to have recourse to Jesuit communities when possible but also gives them a Jesuit com-

munity with which to identify even from a distance. When these ties break down, I think they are in real trouble precisely in their identity as Jesuits and their relationship to the Society. In other words, I am saying that such men can be Jesuits only because there are existing Jesuit communities to which they can relate in some way.

Let us close these remarks on apostolate by another reference to the need for experimentation in this area. Our apostolates simply have to be important ones, ones that make a difference. Our men need this badly. We have to have a sense of doing worthwhile things. The sacrifices this life asks of us are too big to be made for trivial things. We have to be dealing with real and important issues. We have to have a sense of belonging to an organization which makes a difference to men and to the world, which is sensitive to the important issues of today's world, and which is capable of doing something about these issues. This esprit which comes from a felt sense of competence in worthwhile work as Jesuit apostles is one of the greatest helps to community life, prayer, the spiritual life, and everything else. The selection of vital apostolates is utterly important to the entire life of a Jesuit from the very beginning. It not only influences the structures of our formation and our style of life, but it touches upon the very heart of our existence. It determines the type of young men we shall attract to the Society, and even whether we shall attract them at all.

So much for apostolate and its implications for community. Now let us take a look at some practical questions arising from the side of *community*. Here again we need an experimental attitude with which to approach this problem. First, some truisms. (1) Size alone will not solve the problem. There are unsuccessful communities of all sizes, large, medium, and small. (2) It seems to me to be an unrealistic expectation to assign men annually to houses and to expect to have communities right off. It takes years to make a community. If a good community already exists, a small increment can probably be absorbed into the community to the mutual benefit of the old and new members. But large and frequent changes are hard on the community as well as the new men. Of course, if no community exists there, large changes may be a help towards creating a community in time. (3) We should not expect that there is one type of ideal community for which we are searching. Different

temperaments need different living conditions. And even if there were some ideal type of community style for some ideal type of Jesuit, we are all less than ideal, with *de facto* limitations that have to be faced. But I do not believe in ideal types anyhow. I like differences and diversity. So it seems to me there should be a variety of styles available, within which men may be able to find a way to find themselves. Even age is a factor, from the very young in the time of training, to the professionally skilled apostles, to the older men of the Society. It seems to me that the style of life I want to live would be different as I move along through these stages of life in the Society.

World-wide phenomenon

There are a couple of tendencies in the air these days concerning styles of community life. Perhaps the most evident is the mystique of the small community. This is not just a national phenomenon. It was evident at the September meeting in Rome that this preoccupation is world-wide. The desire for the experience of community has led many to want to live in communities small enough so that one's personal presence is felt on the physical, emotional and spiritual level, and one has the opportunity at least to enter into a personal relationship of greater or lesser intensity with each member of the community, so that anonymity is next to impossible. Such living also makes greater demands upon a person and places greater responsibilities upon him. Unlike life in the large institutional seminary, he is not as free to remain on a superficial level in his personal relationships. He cannot as easily avoid the demands of really living *with* others and all the pain and growth that close personal relationships involve. Nor should he be encouraged to avoid such experience.

Another trend of this communitarian sense is the desire to open our houses to non-Jesuits, to extend our hospitality to others, to share our goods and ourselves with them much more readily than we have been accustomed to do in the past. Many do not want our houses to shield us or cut us off from others, but rather to be places where we can welcome all in a true spirit of Christian hospitality. Conflicts arise here between the values of hospitality and privacy, but other people manage to resolve these conflicts without going to either extreme. We can, too.

There are so many possibilities in the air these days. I think it would be wrong to close them out before they have been tried. I resist those who feel that we are floating too freely and without clear directives, and that we should get some order back into the chaos, and quick. First of all, I do not think we can artificially generate order and control when we are not sure what it should be, i.e. order for its own sake. Besides we may have suffered from too much order and control. Secondly, this is a period of change and it is only beginning, if my reading of the signs of the times is at all accurate. I would hate to opt out of all the excitement just as it is getting started. Thirdly, experimentation is the key to living in a period like this, so much so that I would be willing to say that we not only need individual experiments as we face the future, but our whole attitude of life should be experimental. We should develop an experimental cast of mind, even seeing our whole style of life in experimental terms. And besides, what's wrong with a little bit of chaos anyhow? In moderate doses, it's good for us. Life is chaotic to some degree. It is part of being alive and open to the future.

When Woodstock moves, how are we going to live, all 225 or 250 of us? We have talked this thing into the ground. It is time to try things. There are at least four different styles available to us. One rather large central building housing anywhere from 40 to 80. Brownstones housing from 10 to 15. Apartments housing 3 or 4 each, and sections of the boarding facilities of several Protestant seminaries, housing about 20. What should we do? I think we should try all of them simultaneously. With regard to our scholasticates, I think, at least for the theologians, that the large institutional seminary style of living is dead. At present, for our plans for the new Woodstock, I favor a medium-sized central installation of about 40 or 50 people. I would also like to have in this building dining facilities large enough so that the members of the satellite communities could also come there for dinner; and facilities for a late evening social hour for all; plus other recreational facilities. Around this location, I would like to try, in the satellite communities, the other types of living I mentioned earlier, and perhaps even others. I think people should have some variety in the styles of living open to them. I just like variety. There are a whole host of detailed questions about how to decide who lives where; where

the faculty will live; who runs the satellite communities, etc. It might be interesting to know that Father General posed the question to the Rectors of scholasticates at the September meeting in Rome as to what they thought of the idea of self-government in the satellite communities under one overall Rector for the entire complex, in the case of the theologians. Then, before they had a chance to answer, he settled it by saying that, if our men are not capable of this by the late twenties and early thirties, we are in trouble and we are doing something wrong in our formation program.

In all of this we are looking for better community life for its own sake and for its impact upon our apostolate; to be a better community of apostolic religious. Some experiments will succeed and some will fail. But that is the very nature of an experiment. It might, and at least sometimes, it has to fail. If you need to exclude the possibility of failure before acting, you are not experimenting. Experimentation even needs the possibility of failure as a value. Failure in a given experiment gives you new experience and raises new questions, and leads you on to more thinking, talking and acting. In the long run, failure serves success. There is no pure failure, unless we let it be so. Problems are solved by moving ahead. The goal is not the elimination of all problems but the search for the proper problems. We cannot afford the luxury of solving last century's problems, or even last year's problems. Things are moving too fast for that these days. Moving ahead to resolve our present problems is necessary, while at the same time we realize that our solutions will only create new problems. That is fine. The secret is not to be without problems, but to have the right set of problems, —problems with a future.

At the outset, I was asked how the Society of Jesus serves the Church precisely as a religious community. I would like to add the word "today" to that question. How does the Society of Jesus serve the Church today precisely as a religious community? I am sure I cannot give an adequate answer to all that we should be doing. That is what the whole process of the evaluation of our ministries is concerned with. But there is one immense service we can render in this area of concern. We can serve the Church by courageous experimentation in the forms of community and apostolate, thus showing the way for religious life today and into the future. People, religious especially, expect at least this much of us.

CHANGING PATTERNS IN THE JESUIT ORGANIZATION

Vivian Tellis-Nayak, S.J.

exploring general developments and changes

The Society of Jesus as a formal organization that has endured through four hundred years presents a unique field for a variety of interesting sociological investigations: the varying emphasis placed in its history on the bureaucratic or institutionalizing aspects of its administration; the impact of local and central leadership on its morale and performance; and the emergence of formal and informal structures in its diverse cultural environments and situational challenges. The present investigation focuses on one limited aspect of the Jesuit organisation. It is an attempt towards an exploratory study of certain of its general developments and changes, not in terms of a descriptive survey but with a view to identify a few dominant patterns in these developments, to chart their directions and to search for their main organizational causes.

The main hypotheses of the paper are based on a sociological interpretation of Jesuit history and thus refer to the Jesuit Order as a whole. The direct illustrative references to the Indian scene reflect the author's closer and longer familiarity with the men and institutions of the Indian Assistancy which with its nearly 3,000 men is not only the third largest concentration of Jesuits in one country but also somewhat represents the Jesuit traditions of ten European and American countries.

If we take a broad approach to Jesuit history in order to discern the more salient trends in the developments and characteristics of the Order, we might discover that the Jesuit organization has shown a marked emphasis *away* from group action and team effort *in favor* of individual achievement. Whether or not this Jesuit proneness towards individualism has resulted from a manifest attempt on the part of the Order, it has in fact stood out as a dominant feature particularly in its later history.

It should be insisted upon that this lack of group thrust and accent on individual performance is the broader and more marked pattern which stands out in the history of the life and activity of the Order. Deviations from the patterns have occurred, and as we shall later maintain, the trend of events is definitely shifting in our own days. But by and large these deviations have till now been the exceptions rather than the rule. These exceptions are the more significant in a compact, mobile and centralized body of men who have in fact projected an image of being the most well knit and well disciplined religious body in the Church, as well of group solidarity and group impact.

This individualistic trend in Jesuit history is best identified in two of its expressions: a lack of united effort in their work; and a lack of affective group consciousness in their living.

A lack of united effort

An Order which sets for itself the goal of ready service to the Church, and therefore lays importance on its flexibility and promptitude to move into urgent situations and to assume any commitment, the Society of Jesus has not been significantly noted for its coordinated planning, united action or group thrust, This is evidenced by many Jesuit characteristics as they are manifested in their behavior and performance.

A study of the origins of many of the prestigious and successful ventures of the Jesuits would yield one proof. Many of the remarkable Jesuit achievements are not the result of well thought out and planned activity on the part of the Order as such, or even of the local province men. Often these works have had their origins in the vision, zeal and daring of individual charismatic men. Except in the early stages of founding a new province, these zealous pioneers have been less frequently the superiors themselves and

more often the men from the rank and file. Thus many of the more famous Jesuit universities, houses of writers, scholarly journals, social and technical institutes, welfare projects and training institutions grew out of the insight of individual Jesuits who recognized a problem, saw an emerging challenge, and had the courage and strength to launch into a new venture. Not infrequently these new challenges have come as welcome occasions for them to move out of over-institutionalized works and find an outlet for their apostolic zeal in these new tasks.

They have had painfully to convince a not very eager superior, rally enough enthusiasts inside and outside the Order, seek their own financial resources, and go through a very similar process of trial that characterizes the initial effort and drive of charismatics, zealots and revolutionaries. In some instances the Order has come forward with generous financial and personnel assistance only after the new venture had weathered its initial crisis of survival. By and large then most of the historic achievements of Jesuits grew not out of the prevailing mood, initiative or vision of the local Jesuit body as a whole, or even primarily of the superiors, but out of the idealism and drive of individual Jesuits.

A study of the Jesuit staff of most of the larger Jesuit institutions will afford another proof of the lack of cohesive, corporate effort among the Jesuits. Some of the Jesuit universities are a case in point. It is not rare that they have on their staff some brilliant, creative minds remarkable for their administrative or scholarly abilities. And yet many Jesuit universities show a conspicuous lack of team effort, common planning or even scholarly intellectual communion among these intellectuals. More often than not they are lone scholars brilliant in their individual performance, bringing prestige to their Order through their individual scholarly achievements. But they often lack any notable sense of corporate mission in terms of the institution they are working for. They are dedicated in their service to their department and to its growth and development, but they do not necessarily carry a missionary sense towards the whole institution of which their department may only be a part. Thus it happens that many of the bigger Jesuit institutions lack a sufficient interdepartmental communication and support, not in an administrative or bureaucratic sense, but in Jesuit terms, in terms

of personal contribution, common interest and responsibility that might be expected of the members of a religious Order.

Absence of long range policy

A third indication in the same direction could be found in the absence of long-range policies in the choice of ministries and the deployment of forces in individual Jesuit provinces. The commitments a province makes in men, money, effort and time have generally been the decision of the provincial. The relevance and apostolic effectiveness of these commitments have largely depended on the insight and temperament of the provincial. The direction and wisdom of the course a Jesuit province has taken has often depended on the inspiration of the reigning superior. But provincials come and provincials go. Sometimes the newcomers have had radically to reverse the policies of their predecessor when they have not been condemned to perpetuate his mistakes in policy or commitments due to the sheer volume of investment in money and effort.

There is no official administrative body in the province that continues through the reign of more than one man, and which can decisively and consistently affect the policy decisions regarding the province ministries. The provincial consultors lack deliberative power and their nomination depends much on the provincial himself. Whatever organizational or operative benefits might derive from this structure, it is a historical fact that, for instance in some of the Indian provinces, provincials not unduly blessed with leadership, charism, or vision have exercised their zeal and good will so determinedly and decisively that it has taken considerable time and wisdom for their successors to reverse the ill-conceived trends and allay the consequent frustrations in the province.

In rapidly changing societies like India this type of power invested in the leader can redound enormously to the achievement of the Order's goals as well as to their stultification. To a service and apostolate oriented organization like the Jesuits it is crucial that it is equipped with an administrative machinery that can perceptively analyze, and swiftly and wisely decide on the best responses to the continually shifting or growing apostolic challenges that present themselves in a society caught up in an upheaval process. Opportunity or possibility shows itself as unexpectedly as

it slips away and disappears. Only a trained band of experts under the provincial perhaps will be able to remain ever alert to these emerging possibilities and to suggest action that might demand the total mobilization of forces and men. This approach has been largely foreign to Jesuit thinking till now, or at least to their actual behavior. And this perhaps accounts partly for the fact that in rapidly changing societies like India the Jesuit Order has seen an emergence of remarkable individual charism and the initiation of new projects by individual charismatics. But the Order as a whole, at least on the province level, has shown a marked lack of far reaching vision or policy, rationalized planning or organizational thrust in its sporadic and scattered efforts.

All these expressions of Jesuit character and performance indicate that the Jesuit characteristic has not been that of any remarkable team achievement, united action or corporate effectiveness which indeed are a modern concept and technique increasingly evidenced in the team effort of scientists and researchers. The Jesuit organization originated in pre-modern times, times that needed individualists of self confidence and discipline, and produced them.

An absence of affective group consciousness

That was one expression of the individualist slant in the Jesuit. Another is a lack of affective group consciousness and group feeling. This of course is not meant to mean that there is any noteworthy lack of affective unity or feeling of group solidarity among the Jesuits. A group of men sharing the same ideals, formation and religious motivation, not only develop a familial spirit, but they do often feel a legitimate pride in the prestige and achievement of their Order. But still this sense of identification of a Jesuit with his Order is perhaps more of an identification with the world body, its prestige, its public image, rather than any notable group affinity and corporate mission in terms of the local enterprises and institutions he is immediately and directly involved in.

This is particularly true of the more institutionalized institutions of the Order. The larger Jesuit universities where there is a large group of Jesuits living together are again a pointed instance. They are at times a community of scholars living under one roof, but not always or necessarily sharing a distinctive affective interest in the progress of the institution beyond the department under their

care. They live under one roof but are not particularly concerned with the general problems that confront the institution; not spontaneously inclined to study them, get involved in them or volunteer their services to fellow Jesuits affected by them. Rather they are more likely to feel that the larger interests of the institution are the duty of some specified officials perhaps higher up in the hierarchy.

The larger a Jesuit community and a Jesuit institution, the greater is the probability of the incidence of such a phenomenon. Of course every Jesuit community has its informal groups drawn together through friendship, common interest or temperament. Their mutual interest, help and cooperation, which are typical of any such friendship group, really accentuate the fact that the total community lacks a similar emotional group feeling towards the work, well being or excellence of the institution as such.

Thus it seems that the individualistic slant of the Jesuit character can be detected in two of its main expressions: a lack of united, organizational effort and team achievement; and an insufficiency of group consciousness, corporate interest and common responsibility in communities, institutions and regions.

The trend of individualism in Jesuit history, whatever its depth and intensity, is distinctive enough to affect the Jesuit character at various levels and in different ways. Its roots likewise can be traced to different levels of Jesuit existence. At the deepest level its main cause stems from the general orientation of Jesuit training and spirit.

The *Constitutions* of the Order and the Jesuit philosophy of life have geared Jesuit training to produce fully equipped, self sufficient, well rounded individualists, rather than men trained to depend and rely on, cooperate and join forces with their fellow men.

The theory and technique of Jesuit training have aimed at producing men suited for the purpose of the Order with its heavy emphasis on mobility and adaptability. If it purports to be of ready service to the Church in any urgency, then the Society of Jesus should cultivate the only Jesuit characteristic, as the present general has been fond of saying, of not having any characteristic at all; it needs then to be highly centralized in its command with full operating authority vested in the superior at various levels; it finds it necessary to solemnly bind itself in direct obedience to the Pope; but above all it needs to have at its disposal and at its ready command

dependable men with a generalized training, confident of singly facing the more common challenges of the apostolic life, prepared to switch roles and places and often pioneer alone into new forms of activity.

The theory and practice of group dynamics are largely absent in the Jesuit *Constitutions*, training and life. The times and situations in which the Jesuits had their origins neither knew nor very much needed team apostolate and team activity (as we know them today) for the planning and execution of strategies. St. Ignatius and his *Constitutions* are in this respect very much the creatures of their age.

Group solidarity

In the Jesuit *Constitutions* and tradition, group solidarity and loyalty are much more viewed as a religious requirement and Christian principle, rather than as a technique and strategy for the success and effectiveness of the Order. The familial feeling that the Jesuit *Constitutions* try to foster is much more love oriented than action oriented. St. Ignatius who so ingeniously provides his men, through his *Constitutions* and *Spiritual Exercises,* the psychological aids and structural pressures needed for attaining whatever important purposes he thought were essential to his Order, significantly relies mainly on religious exhortation and Christian motivation to promote the harmony and unity he deemed essential among his men. He structured his Order on paternalistic lines not fraternal, monarchic not democratic. The subjects have direct and immediate access to the superior, but it is always in secret and in confidence, never through group representation, The creation of public opinion among Jesuits or the generation of any social or group pressure to influence the judgement or action of the superiors, is entirely foreign to the Jesuit *Constitutions* and thinking.

A major contributory element in a Jesuit's training and life is his intimate and repeated association with the *Spiritual Exercises.* Jesuits as a whole, like all their General Congregations, have with near unanimity claimed to base their personal and their Order's spirit and inspiration on the *Spiritual Exercises.* The *Spiritual Exercises* on their part lay insistent and heavy emphasis on the personal encounter of an individual with Christ. There is barely any mention in them of communal techniques or group dynamics in the attaining or sustenance of the religious experience. Neither do the

Spiritual Exercises rely very much on group liturgy as of central importance for their purpose. The more recent introduction of group techniques or of some forms of liturgical practices into the *Spiritual Exercises* has not been unanimously welcomed even among the experts. The *Spiritual Exercises* stress the face to face meeting with Christ of a Christian, alone and not in the company of fellow believers. The *Exercises,* like the *Constitutions,* rely entirely on personal prayer, personal meditation, particular examen, general examen and such like individualistic techniques for the attaining of self discipline and self perfection. The aid of the superior or the spiritual father in this process is asked for and received in private.

All through his formation the procedures utilized to encourage a Jesuit to receive criticism from and offer it to his fellow Jesuits, again focus on the discipline and perfection of the individual and thus help train a perceptive and ready critic rather than a cooperative team mate. This orientation begins in his noviceship and ends in producing within the Order the whole spectrum of theological positions, approaches to life, ideas and opinions. It has been suggested that every type of Christian, conservative or liberal, liturgist or antiliturgist, reactionary or enlightened, can search and find among the Jesuits a staunch ally.

The Order's concern for producing a "perfect" individual is again evidenced in the remarkable variety and yet the generalized quality of the academic training which a Jesuit receives—or used to till recently. Specialization was always in addition to this generalized training. Jesuits were, and in some places even now are, not told till the last days of their training what their future work would be, or what was to await them once they left the formation house. They were supposed to be generally equipped and emotionally detached enough to accept any one of the diverse and unrelated functions in the Province—parish work, education, missions.

This practice is indeed suggestive of the lack of a general, long-range plan on the part of the local superior as to the deployment of his men. But nonetheless this practice is in part a survival of an older tradition and a relic from older times when an intensified humanistic, philosophical, and theological training sufficiently equipped a Jesuit to meet effectively the demands of his times and vocation. But a deep rooted tradition dies hard; so even in an age

of specialisation and of declining vocations which would demand a wisely economical utilization of talent, Jesuit parish priests, missionaries, spiritual fathers etc., hardly receive any specialised theological or practical training in their specialized vocation.

The concept and practice of Jesuit obedience

The general theory and direction of Jesuit training are one cause of Jesuit individualism. This has been further complemented by the concept of obedience prevalent in the Order. Obedience in its concept and practice in the Society of Jesus was indeed only a reflection of the thinking and practice in the Church. For a religious the will of God was manifested through the will of the superior, and the religious perfection of the subject lay in its conformity to it. The central thing was the content of the superior's command, not its wisdom; the subject's compliance, not his initiative; his execution of the deed, not his contribution in its planning. This militaristic Jesuit approach was not designed to encourage the participation of the subject in the joint planning and mutual exchange of ideas between the superior and the subject, and even less among the subjects themselves. Dialogue, an open give-and-take approach and corporate effort are almost entirely a recently phenomenon among the Jesuits.

Again Jesuit obedience, perhaps much against its founder's intent and its earlier tradition, came to be looked upon more as a means for the subject's sanctification rather than for apostolic effectiveness. There are very recent and striking instances where individual superiors have utilized religious obedience to test the religious spirit and religious detachment of their subjects even when it has resulted in individual frustrations and damage to the quality and future of Jesuit works. This accent on the "sacrificial" aspect rather than the functional in obedience, is also the cause, though not always the only or the main one, for the wasteful employment of Jesuit talent, as seen for example in the fairly abundant and widespread instances even in recent history when highly qualified men have been assigned to tasks for which they had little talent or interest. As early as in the time of Father General Ledochowski, the General had reminded the superiors of the gravity of their responsibility in this regard.

An obedient and ideal Jesuit has sometimes been characterized

as a person standing with his one foot raised ready to march when and where the superior might order him. This stress on the militaristic, "sacrificial" and unpredictable aspect of Jesuit obedience, conducive as it is not to let a Jesuit get institutionalized or anchored to any task or position, nevertheless has stressed the vertical aspect of his obedience and not sufficiently the importance of the horizontal dimension of his life.

A further cause of the individualistic trait in the Jesuit character is the historical development of the existing form of Jesuit community living. The stress in many Jesuit communities has been on "common life" rather than on "communal living". The insistence on common rules, procedures and practices which promote physical presence and contact rather than meaningful interaction among intellectuals, has tended to breed frustrations, escapist mechanisms and individualistic deviances which in fact are the common malaise in most of the bigger Jesuit communities. Rarely do these larger communities exhibit any distinctive family spirit. Personal problems, sickness or absence, like Jesuit guests, hardly attract the notice or the affective interest of the community members preoccupied with their individual work and commitments. Though small compensatory circles of friends do develop along lines of interest or common work, Jesuit communities not rarely resemble hostels where individuals return for board and lodging rather than for inspiration, understanding and support as to a religious family.

A final cause of Jesuit individualism might spring from the sheer size of the Order as the largest in the Church. Numerical growth in provinces and communities renders frequent and meaningful communication difficult between superiors and subjects as well as among subjects themselves. As the superior finds it harder to maintain full knowledge and control of his men, to keep ready and direct contact with them and to render inspiring and effective leadership, the subjects' communication with the superior tends to become less frequent and more difficult, hurried, and impersonal. In the Jesuit structure, the role and leadership of the superior play a vital cohesive function through the enthusiasm, cooperation, and team participation he elicits among his men for the common tasks. Impersonality and impotency in the exercise of his leadership therefore can foster an atomization of forces and an individualism among the personnel.

In summary, therefore, it might be said that the Jesuit Order which organizationally is so well knit, centralized in its command and disciplined in its training and form, has not exhibited a proportionately organized and concentrated thrust in its team effort or in its corporate effectiveness to attain its goal. This development which has been characterized by a certain individualism among Jesuits, is not merely an accidental historical development, but in fact it has its roots in the *Constitutions*, the structural set-up and the peculiar philosophic bias of the Jesuit system.

Complementary developments

The individualistic development which we have tried to identify was a predominant characteristic of Jesuit history. More recently rapid and radical changes have been taking place in the thinking and behavior of the Jesuits. These new trends which seem to be on the whole complementary to the previous developments found expression in the deliberations of the 31st General Congregation and received their official sanction in its *Decrees*.

The General Congregation though not entirely representative or reflective in its participating delegates of the opinions and ideas among the Jesuits, yet for curious reasons did reflect their dominant mood and aspirations in its Decrees which were therefore accepted with surprising and almost universal satisfaction even among the younger, restless section of the Order. This favorable response more than their binding force is likely to make these *Decrees* the guiding norms, which they are meant to be, for the current developments, changes and experiments that are taking place in the Order and are explicitly encouraged by the *Decrees* themselves.

Among the vastly different areas and forms in which these new experiments are being conducted one can observe the emergence of a somewhat general pattern and theme. The direction of this emerging pattern seems to run counter to the earlier individualistic trends and in essence serves to complement them. This new pattern of events is highlighted in the following trends.

There is a marked new trend towards fostering a group consciousness through personal and corporate involvement in the commitments of the Order. It seems to be increasingly realized in the Order that common traditions, life, and goals have to be supple-

mented by common action and participation in order to generate group feeling. There are a number of changes that are encouraging this united effort.

The General Congregation has called for a "Commission on Ministries" to be set up in every province for the study and suggestion of priorities of action. It is intended to be a kind of permanent task force represented by experts from various province activities, who remain sensitive to emerging challenges in their region and suggest appropriate action. This experiment is meant to be a step towards rationalizing the province effort; but like the current General Sociological Survey of the Society of Jesus it has also the latent function of involving the men of a province in the study of their common apostolic problems and in the planning and execution of the strategy to meet them. This new experiment in different forms is being tried at different levels in communities and regions where expert bodies, study groups, and committees are set up for the dual purpose of keeping in mutual contact men directly involved in different particular problems, and also for studying and suggesting solutions to different problems of Jesuit life and activity.

An even more far reaching change in this direction is the new participation of every formed Jesuit in the government and official policy of the province and the Society. In the future the delegates to the province congregation will not be the senior most professed men of the province, but those from every rank of the formed Jesuits elected by the personal vote of every province man. This is entirely a new and bold step towards democratic behavior hitherto alien to the Jesuit system. It is very likely that this participation will soon be even more democratized with the levelling off of the grades among formed Jesuits which will entitle every Jesuit priest to be elected for the General Congregation.

Isolationism

Along with democratic developments goes a new effort to break down isolationism among provinces. Inter-provincial cooperation, exchange and communication are indeed an innovation where formerly Jesuit provinces were patterned after Catholic dioceses where the provincial, like the bishop in his diocese, was solely in command and answerable only and directly to the general in Rome. Not only are inter-provincial meetings becoming the order of the day, and

provincials of a country are being obliged to meet annually for a review of policy, but in some regions the general is experimenting with new tasks assigned to super or inter-provincials in the interest of better efficiency in planning, cooperation, and use of personnel.

The installation of the four general assistants, of expert consultors and advisors to the general can be viewed as steps in the same direction though at a higher level; which fact highlights the paradoxical nature of the new pattern of events: a decentralization of authority and emphasis on localism which go hand in hand with centralized planning and heightened communication.

Another sacred tradition of the Order went overboard when the General Congregation dropped the absolute secrecy imposed on its delegates and itself set up an efficient information service that kept the whole Society briefed on the current developments in the discussion and mood of the Congregation fathers. In stark contrast to previous comparable experience in congregation history, this innovation evoked a keen sense of participation and involvement among the Jesuits in the tasks and decisions of the Congregation.

Perhaps encouraged by this experience the 31st General Congregation further decreed the erection of an information center at Rome, more efficient and expert than before, to keep the 35,500 Jesuits in the world informed, in a more readable medium than Latin, about the major activities and problems of the Order. Jesuits from many countries or group of countries are seeking to set up, as in Asia for example, similar and more functional regional centres that could render specialised service to a group of provinces to facilitate exchange of men, means, news and ideas. The 31st General Congregation has also in an unprecedented decree asked the general to be in personal and frequent contact with his men around the globe through regular journeys. The journeys Father General Arrupe has already undertaken to meet and live with his men span the entire globe; they have served as a potent factor in engendering enthusiasm, interest, and a sense of affinity among Jesuits regarding the tasks confronting the Order as a whole.

Thus through common action, involvement, participation, and representation in government, as well as through meaningful interprovincial cooperation, the Jesuits are trying to achieve a new deepened sense of group consciousness.

Democratic ways in government and style of life are one major trend; the other, on a different level, can be noticed in the new forms of community living being evolved in the Order.

Communal living

A Jesuit's life is not necessarily a community life, and where it is lived in large, institutionalized communities it has generated many problems. One of the important new changes in this regard is the attempt to break down large communities in order to establish small houses in the hope of fostering a personalized living and interaction. In some provinces Jesuits attached to a university live in rented apartments in small groups, while the existing large communities are experimenting in new forms to create opportunities for more meaningful communication among the members. Thus committees or groups are set up to assume the responsibility for the efficient functioning of some areas of community life. Some times the community is assembled by the superior in small or big groups for dialogue sessions for the purpose of communicating information about his problems or policies, for eliciting ideas, or for deliberative action on their part regarding some of their common problems.

Where the big communities had fostered anonymous living and impersonality of contact, these new forms of cooperation, dialogue and group action are slowly encouraging the responsibility and interest of everyone towards the community at large. Unfamiliarity and artlessness in the use of the tools of group dynamics are the cause in some places of fresh frustrations or resentment on the part of some too accustomed to an old form of life. But in some other quarters the experiment is subtly and surely changing the style of Jesuit living. For example Jesuit refectories no longer remind one of military barracks with their long rows of dining tables; in their place now one discovers small tables around which men meet, relax and dialogue during meals.

This same trend is more markedly obvious in the formation houses which are generally the largest communities of the Jesuits. Significantly the General Congregation chose to promulgate its first decree about scholastics in training; specifically regarding these bigger houses the General Congregation decreed that a new pattern of life must be encouraged in the future whereby young Jesuits live in small separate communities in different houses from where they attend common classes and are guided by one and the same faculty.

Experiments in small group activities, including the celebration of liturgy in little intimate groups, find a variety of expressions in these communities, on the theory that personalized contact and training in dialogue and team responsibility during one's formation years are going to equip a Jesuit with the openness of mind and faith in team effort needed for the future work of the Order.

A new theological approach

A third and in a sense deeper trend can be noted in the new Jesuit thinking and approach to religious obedience. There is a growing importance now being placed on the obedience of function rather than the obedience of faith. The General Congregation in its *Decree on Obedience* and Fr. Arrupe in his press conference of November 24, 1966 at the close of the Congregation widely reflect the thinking in the Society when they place religious obedience in a perspective of the cooperative effort of the community and the superior to find the objective will of God defined in terms of the best possible service to the Church and to the world. Obedience thus is being seen as a concern for a goal oriented rather than a law oriented living.

This mentality can be seen operative in many of the new changes. Obedience is now becoming a means for efficiency and the maximum utilization of individual resources and talents, while on the other hand personal fulfilment and the conscious interior growth of the subject is getting equal attention. The young Jesuit is no more just assigned to acquire specialization in any field according to the needs of the Order and not with much regard for individual interest or talent. He is now on the contrary encouraged early in his formation to assume personal responsibility for the choice of the area of his development and life's task in the light of the needs of the Society.

Conformity to rules and regulations as the sole criterion of perfection is a notion that is being replaced by the conviction that the Rule affords one only a general guidance for the meaningful interpretation of one's situation in the context of the common good. Thus decisions regarding prayer times and prayer duration are largely left to the discretion of individuals. The hitherto grave Church obligation of reciting the breviary is in many places being commuted, with official approval, to the reading of Scripture or

other prayerful activity. "Custom Books" had become an institutionalized tradition in the late history of the Jesuits. Many provincials had edited new "Custom Books" and had them approved by Father General Janssens a little before the Congregation took place. These "Custom Books" with their heavy legal overtones detailed norms for the practical behavior of individuals in different provinces even to the extent of defining their behavior on the beach, their partaking of liquor outside the Jesuit house, and their modes of travel. The General Congregation has suddenly rendered obsolete the very idea of the "Custom Books".

This new emphasis on personal growth and fulfilment seems to be oriented to foster and sustain the corporate feeling of community which the Jesuits are looking for. Individuals make an aggregate; only persons can make up a family or community. Individualism accentuates self sufficiency, independence, and isolationism, while openness to others through personalized living, fruitful cooperation and pooling of strength, contribute to personal fulfilment and make for the cohesive affinity and strength of a community of men.

PSYCHOLOGICAL DIMENSIONS OF THE "JESUIT FAMILY"

Joseph J. Papaj, S.J.

evaluating the traditional

The use of metaphor, image, figurative language in general, to express deeper realities in a way that can be more easily comprehended by an individual is not a modern phenomenon. Far from being a dangerous approach, furthermore, it has been a valid source in the history of man's continuing quest for knowledge. Danger, however, does arise when the image is taken to represent literally the reality towards which it points, or when the image has, in the course of time, changed its connotations or means something other than when the image was first used. Such is the danger which faces the Society of Jesus (and probably other religious orders as well) today as it directs its energies toward a renewal in the sphere of community life.

The Jesuit community has traditionally been viewed as a "family" in which each individual lives out his life in carefully defined actions of charity to his "brothers" and of obedience to his superior, whom he theoretically regards as a "father". The origins of this figurative way of speaking of a Jesuit community are difficult to trace; the Jesuit "family concept" is much more an oral sort of tradition rather than a carefully worked out written thesis. Nonetheless, it did begin and is still very much in vogue today. Edward Heenan, S.J., in suggesting small task-oriented communities as a solution to our contemporary quest for more realistic communal

living, points out a primary function of any religious community, large or small. "The religious community," he writes, "should be a family, an in-group, or a primary group. . . ."[1] Or again, the recent American Assistancy Conference at Santa Clara recommends that, as a help to fostering our community life, "our communities should be true homes in which all members . . . feel equally at home,"[2]—an implicit recognition of this traditional family image.

The thesis of this paper maintains that, at least unwittingly, such an approach to the Jesuit community is rooted in a false understanding of the meaning of "family." As will be shown, the equating of community with family reflects an identification with a pre-contemporary model of the family. This model, under the force of a consistently growing technology, has rearranged itself into a newer reality—a "nuclear" family where roles have shifted, functions have changed. Unless this fact is recognized and taken into consideration on the practical level of daily living all efforts at community renewal are doomed to inadequacy and, paraphrasing Cornell psychologist Uric Bronfenbrenner, to depriving member Jesuits of essential human experience.[3]

After an examination of the shift in the family model the paper further contends that a more fruitful approach to community life can be found in the findings of modern theological studies, and that these can be reconciled with the concept of "family" so traditional among Jesuits. Only in this way will the establishment of a Jesuit family offer any meaningful value to the individual member of the contemporary Society of Jesus.

The family model

Even a cursory glance at some of the materials available on recent scientific studies of the concept of "family" will immediately reveal the complexity involved in applying such a concept to a reality such as Jesuit community living. One must accept the fact that the word "family" has many emotional associations and is

---

[1] Edward F. Heenan, S.J., "A Quest for Religious Community," WOODSTOCK LETTERS, 96 (1967), 297.

[2] *Proceedings of the Conference on the Total Development of the Jesuit Priest* (Santa Clara, 1967), Vol. 3, Prt. 2, C68.

[3] Uric Bronfenbrenner, quoted in the *Time* essay: "On Being An American Parent," *Time* (December 15, 1967), p. 31.

understood in different ways by different people.[4] One must also accept the difficulty that confronts any attempt to establish a general picture of those characteristics which constitute the "normal" family and which may be applicable to all families;[5] family characteristics will vary with ethnic backgrounds, cultural contexts, immediate social environments, and a variety of other factors. Nonetheless, these studies do offer a number of specific areas where, phenomenologically considered, the change that has taken place in the family model may be discerned.

The first of these areas is the father. It has been pointed out that before the technological advances of our modern society the father's role had a clearly defined function: he was the "bread maker." As such, he was evidently the most important member of the family, holding a position of honor that carried with it a demand for respect from all other members of the family. The family structure, thus, was markedly lineal. In his examination of the family pattern in contemporary society, Dr. John Spiegel highlights this hierarchical rather than individualistic patterning by considering an American family with Irish ethnic background. One of his observations on the discernible traces of the former family set-up in Ireland (where technology had not as yet so powerfully influenced the family as in America) is striking for its relevance to Jesuit living. "At mealtime," he states, "the father and the male children are served before the wife and the girl children."[6] Making the necessary change in reading "older members" for "male children" and "younger members" for "girl children," a Jesuit need only recall his experience at dinner time in most of the refectories he has been in to see how this former trait of the family is still very much in vogue with the Society today.

With the entrenchment of technology in modern life, however, the father has become a "bread-winner" and with this shift there was entailed a number of ramifications in the family structure. His

[4] Cf. Norman W. Bell and Ezra F. Vogel, "Toward a framework for Functional Analysis of Family Behavior," *A Modern Introduction to the Family* (New York, 1960), p. 1.

[5] Elizabeth Batt, "Norms and Ideology: The Normal Family," *ibid.*, p. 435.

[6] John P. Spiegel, M.D., "Homeostatic Mechanisms Within the Family," *The Family in Contemporary Society*, edited by Iago Galdston, M.D. (New York, 1958), p. 86.

new role now necessitated his absence from the home; there resulted a number of negative effects on family members ranging from the diminishing influence of an authority figure to low self-esteem to hunger for immediate gratification to susceptibility to group influence.[7] Again a Jesuit need only reflect on the superior's position as it has been put before him from the novitiate on, and on the ideal type of relation between subject and superior which accompanies that position to see how outmoded is this kind of son-father paradigm. Given this new type of family background it becomes easy to find, in this unrealistic approach, an explanation for the absence in young Jesuits of warm, cordial feelings to superiors and a positive cause of many of the tensions in community living.

A second area in which the family model changed is in that of the mother. No longer merely a childbearer, she now assumes a significant portion of that responsibility which was formerly her husband's. She finds herself in a situation where a closeness with her children, formerly unthinkable, is now possible. When the children reach the age of four, however, contemporary society assumes the task of educating the children and the wife finds it possible to obtain a job and/or become involved in various activities that take her out of the family circle. Precisely how this fact has altered the power structure of the family is disputed and open to discussion.[8] Nonetheless, the point is that the mother's role has shifted and, as will be pointed out, such a change contributes significantly to today's family model.

The implications contained in the previous considerations of father and mother regarding a third area—that of the children—need not, for the purposes of this paper, be fully developed. The fact that change has taken place here too should be obvious. It is only necessary to point out the development of the freer, more individualistic position which children hold today in the family. Parents' expectations of what their children are to be are no longer confined, for the most part, to following in the parents' footsteps.

[7] These are the findings of studies on father-absent homes referred to in "On Being an American Parent," *op. cit.*, p. 30.

[8] Robert O. Blood, Jr. and Robert L. Hamblin, for example, maintain there is no significant alteration. Cf. "The Effects of the Wife's Employment on the Family Power Structure," *A Modern Introduction to the Family, op. cit.*, pp. 137-142.

Likewise, the assimilation of values no longer relies solely on the family but has widened to make room for the influence of the peer group. Finally, the children of today are expected to contribute much more to helping reach decisions regarding family concerns. Granted that a communication gap seems to be a widespread, communal characteristic of the family, nonetheless the new family set-up, especially as a system in which an interchange of roles is predominant[9], has produced a generation which has experienced a new freedom in family activities never before possible in the family model. It is imperative to keep in the background these new traits of freedom and mobility in our later discussion of the family concept in the Jesuit community.

New roles

From this examination of the family system one may correctly conclude that a change in the process to which the concept "family" has been attached has taken place, and is still going on. Contemporary society finds a new, albeit generalized, family model in which the roles of members has shifted. But accompanying this shift of roles is likewise a number of new characteristics in the functions performed by individual members of the family. Authority no longer lies in the person of one member alone but now extends to the mother who has been forced to accept much of the responsibility in this area. The family is no longer the major economic unit in which the children help with the task of "making bread"; unifying economic functions were lost and the individual has become the major economic unit. Thus, one of the principal causes of family cohesion has given way to a new emphasis on individual competency. Furthermore, it is precisely in terms of this competency that the current family policy of a corporate decision-making practice had developed, replacing the former policy of "father says 'do this!'" and everyone followed. Co-relative with the breakdown of cohesion are the various manifestations of a new diffusion in the

[9] Morris Zehlitch, Jr., in "Role Differentiation in the Nuclear Family: A Comparative Study," *A Modern Introduction, op. cit.*, pp. 329-338, studies this phenomenon in some detail. While he concludes that the nuclear family "differentiates in the direction expected and allocates the relevant roles to the persons expected," p. 337, his observations in its variation in specific activities are highly relevant to the ideas presented in this paper.

family, recreation outside the family circle and involvement in outside interests, to mention just two examples. And finally, we may add the characteristic of competition that takes place within the family, a process which has gone to such an extreme that one may observe a new phase germinating: the striking alienation that is taking place today between the young generation and their parents.

At the outset this paper submitted that Jesuit community life has failed to take cognizance of the change in the family model. While again this is a generalization, and as such is necessarily opened to modifications, at this point the author would like to show from personal experience how such thinking manifests a pre-technological understanding of the family. The connection of this with the remarks just presented will be sufficiently evident by themselves to make further development unwarranted.

The example of the Jesuit refectory has already been cited. More significant is the charge frequently levelled whenever younger Jesuits try to make honest suggestions about improvements in time order, the way work may be more efficiently carried out, and the like. "They are trying to take over," "they're ruining our hard work," and similar remarks are typical of the comments that can be heard in the haustus room. Surely no recognition is given in such instances to the fact that this kind of thing has been part of the young Jesuit's upbringing in his family.

Another instance personally experienced is the superior who feels that villa or mid-term vacation periods should be spent by having the younger members of the community pack their bags and retreat to some far-off site for a joyful period of togetherness. To widen the scope of this way of thinking, what Jesuit doesn't recall a superior who criticizes members because they will not join in with the others at communal recreation after dinner or because they bury themselves in the evening newspaper? Or again, what of the often repeated argument that everyone should be together for, as an example, Christmas day? The contemporary family does not operate this way and yet it is still expected that the Jesuit family will.

Finally, in the area of competency, many Jesuits are still expected to teach in high school for three years—even though it quickly becomes obvious that not everyone is capable of this. Likewise, one's interest in his own special field must be subservient to the course

requirements expected of all Jesuits, and his future is determined by his success in this. Recently a theologian received a communication from a prefect of studies in answer to his request to accept a position with a university offering him a fellowship during his fourth year of theology in conjunction with doctoral work in history. Permission would be withheld pending high marks by the scholastic in his theology courses. And how many Jesuits have been complemented by either superiors or fellow members for success achieved in fields of endeavor in anyway out of the ordinary, run-of-the-mill works of the Society?

These comments, admittedly, do not represent the total experience of Jesuit community life, nor, perhaps, even the more significant aspects. They do indicate, however, a fair representation of how the Society's image of "family" has failed to embrace a newer reality operative in community life. The question then arises: how should such life be conceived? One answer might be to think of it still in terms of the family image but as now including the newer reality outlined above. Perhaps a more fruitful approach can be found in some of the suggestions developed in recent theological studies; it is to these, then, that attention is turned.

Recent theological findings

Modern science's challenge, represented by such writers as Sigmund Freud and Julian Huxley, to the significance of religion in man's life has been met by a number of Protestant and Catholic theologians. In examining the charge that religion is only a psychological device to enable the projection of wish-fulfillments or to explain the mysteries of the natural world these theologians have responded in a variety of ways which reflect several points of view; two main streams, however, can be discerned. On the one hand, the cry of God's death, first shouted by Nietzsche in *Thus Spake Zarathustra*, has echoed in some writings. William Hamilton summarizes this approach when he states: "the death of God must be affirmed; the confidence with which we thought we could speak of God is gone, and our faith, belief, and experience of Him are very poor things indeed."[10] An attempt is made, on the other hand, to

[10] William Hamilton, "The Death of God Theologies Today," *Radical Theology and the Death of God*, Hamilton and Thomas Altizer (New York, 1966), p. 41.

speak of God today in a non-religious way by focusing on the trait of secularism characteristic of contemporary society. Harvey Cox is typical of this treatment when he characterizes today's world as the secular city which is the emergent kingdom of God and states that man's task is to make Christianity something which works in the world.

Both of these streams of thought contribute material relevant to the concerns of this paper. First of all, man's capabilities and autonomy are given recognition on grounds that cannot be rejected. Secondly, the person of Jesus Christ is given a renewed centrality in the contemporary thoughts of religion. The role of revelation, finally, in man's life is highlighted in a meaningful way. When all these patterns are woven together a design of man's life results—one which is fruitful, relevant, and authentic to his everyday existence. According to this design God has revealed himself in Jesus of Nazareth. This Christ *is* the perfect man, like to us in all things save sin. This Jesus had one predominant characteristic which is set before all men as the ideal to be attained: the service of others. In imitating those actions of service which Christ has revealed as man's way of being related to the divine, contemporary man waters the seeds of the divine which exist in his nature because of God's revelation of his word in the human form of Christ. Furthermore, by so serving his neighbor, man accepts God's continual revelation of himself in man and gives reality to a theoretical God-man relationship grounded in a valid theological foundation.

Conclusions

In view of these considerations of the family model and of recent theological developments a theoretical solution to the question "in what terms should the Jesuit community be conceived?" is possible. Such a community must be a place where the ideal of Christ's service to others can be realized. The primary function of each member will be to help the others with whom he is associated and, in turn, be helped by him. As this is done force is gathered so that the individual Jesuit can extend his service to his neighbor living outside the community. Such a situation is not incompatible with the family image that has become associated with it—at least understood in its modern characteristics. One characteristic predominant in the ideal family model of contemporary society, mu-

tuality, directly complements the scheme of man's relationship with God set forth above. Basically mutuality means that the members of the family function for the benefit of the other members. It involves a certain amount of give-and-take; it involves creating the possibilities for enabling each person to fulfill his own unique identity and to help the others fulfill theirs. Dr. Martin Goldberg gives a clearer idea of the meaning of mutuality when he describes the emotional functions of the family as: somehow meeting the needs of each individual member for love and/or intimacy; providing the opportunity for the opposite quality of privacy; helping each member to achieve a solid, satisfying sense of identity; and helping each other to find a meaning in life.[11]

Exactly how this community is to be realized and function in the concrete is a problem beyond the scope of this paper. The concern here has been to show how and why the family notion in such a community is an impossible way of thinking—at least as long as it shows remnants of an earlier family model. Furthermore, the groundwork has been laid for a possible replacement to this type of approach in the Society. Although refinements are necessary, which undoubtedly will take surprising and unexpected forms, a community of members living in service for others nonetheless appears to be a fruitful avenue to follow. Not only does such an approach capture the spirit of the second rule in the *Summary of The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus*; it is also good psychology and good theology.

[11] Martin Goldberg, M.D., "The Dynamics of the Family Unit," *Family, Church, and Community,* edited by Angelo D'Agostino, S.J., M.D. (New York, 1965), pp. 67-80.

THE PLACE OF COMMUNITY IN JESUIT LIFE

WILLIAM W. MEISSNER, S.J.

community life
is a skill

I AM PROMPTED by some of the ongoing experiments in community living to bring together some random thoughts and reflections on the impact and implications of community in the lives of Jesuits. The 31st General Congregation placed a new emphasis on the importance of community life for the stability of the religious life of the vows. In the decree on "Community Life and Religious Discipline" the Congregation made the following statement:

> When community flourishes, the whole religious life is sound. Obedience, for instance, is a very clear expression of our cooperation toward common ends, and it becomes more perfect to the extent that superiors and subjects are bound to one another in trust and service. Chastity is more safely preserved, "when there is a true brotherly love in community life between the members." Poverty, finally, means that we have made ourselves poor by surrendering ourselves and our possessions to follow the Lord. Community life aids and assists us in this surrender in a great variety of ways, and in its own unique way is the support of poverty. When the religious life is thus strengthened, unity and flexibility, universality, full personal dedication, and the freedom of the Gospels, are also strengthened for the assistance of souls in every way. And this was the intention of the first companions.[1]

Moreover, there is in the experience of individual Jesuits an abundance of evidence which bears out the importance of community life for the individual. I would like to discuss some of the aspects of community life which seem to me to have some importance for the individual members participating in it.

[1] *Documents of the 31st General Congregation,* Decree 19, No. 4.

Formative aspects of community

Participation in community life, especially the community life of the Society is not a natural gift. It is a skill, a learned capacity. The novice brings with him, when he enters the Society, a certain set of skills in community living which he has acquired and developed in the context of the microcommunity of the family. He has learned there the rudiments of obedience, interaction with authority figures, participation in shared activities and cooperative effort for the attainment of group goals. The experience of his school years and the adjustments of adolescence all contribute to an enlargement and amplification of these basic skills by which an individual interacts with and participates in a group.

Consequently, the novice initiates his experience in the life of the religious community with a certain backlog of experience and with a set of relatively well evolved mechanisms by which he can cope with the demands of living in the novitiate community. The possession of these skills and experiences is both an asset and a liability. They are assets in so far as they promote or enable the process of coping and adjusting. The mechanisms are necessary and adaptive since without them adjustment to the demands of community life would not be possible. But they can be and usually are liabilities as well. They are liabilities in so far as they must be modified in their very use or they become maladaptive. In a sense this is in some measure true of all major human adaptations. The mechanisms and skills learned in some other adaptive context are the ones which are available to the person as he enters the new context. The persistence in the use of previously acquired adaptive capacities in a context in which they are no longer suitable becomes inappropriate. The capacities learned in the interactions of the family and with his peers can carry the novice along the first steps of his participation in the life of the community. But he cannot rely on those skills and must modify them and acquire new ones in his interaction with the community.

The necessary adaptive skills are not transmissible by any mode of formal instruction. What needs to be learned is not easily formulated in a set of propositions. It is woven out of the fabric of human interaction. The novice must learn by an ongoing interaction with the community and the community must teach through its continuous presence to the novice. The community shares what is

uniquely its own with its newly adapting member. It exerts itself to modify that member in the direction of becoming a participating part of the community. The community communicates its values, ideals, attitudes, beliefs, customs, and whatever else is constitutive of itself as a viable community. In so doing, it exerts a subtle but nonetheless definite pressure on the novice. He is forced to come to some compromise with the pressures of the community. His membership is a function of his adaptability in that membership is defined in fact by the degree to which the individual accepts and internalizes the implicit standards and characteristic values of the community.

Thus the first importance of community in Jesuit life is that it serves a formative function. That formative function is all the more significant in that those who subject themselves to it are by and large in that developmental phase of the life cycle called late adolescence. In that period of personality formation there is a more or less definitive crystallization of value-orientations, the basic configuration of adult character structure is being constructed, the personality is forming itself in the mature and adult modality. That time of life is a sort of second chance to redeem the mishaps of early deprivations or developmental deficits. Its significance for the emergence of adult character cannot be overemphasized. The impact of the community pressures are of major significance, therefore, and it is well to remind ourselves of the fact that the community as such is one of the major vital influences in fostering or impeding the growth to maturity of young religious.

One of the persistent and chronic problems in the Society and more generally in religious life is the kind of cultural discontinuity that exists between the formative phase of community life, which obtains in the novitiate setting specifically and more generally in the houses of formation, and the post-formation phase of community life which obtains after the formal training is completed. It is as though the novices were cultivated in relation to an ideal of community life which persists only in houses of training. The formative influence is exercised in isolation from the demands of community life as it obtains in the active apostolic communities. I have no wish to debate the relative merits of novitiate versus apostolic forms of community life; I wish only to note the discontinuity that presents itself and comment briefly on its implications.

The disruptive influence of such cultural discontinuities was originally noted by Ruth Benedict. The adaptive style formed in a life context are confronted by the demands of a new role and function forced on the individual by the inexorable processes of maturation and development. The old mechanisms of adaptation do not answer to the new demands and the result is told in terms of anxiety, conflict of values, ambivalence toward authority, etc. The style of interaction with the community which is developed in the early formative years may have little relevance to the style of interaction which emerges in more mature years. The point I wish to emphasize, however, is that it is the community which places the demand on the individual to adapt and which dictates the interactive context in terms of which he must adapt. Thus it is not individuals who create the discontinuities, but the divergent quality and structure of community styles.

Identification

The basic mechanism by which the interrelation of individual and community is achieved is that of identification. The mechanism is complex and a full discussion of its psychodynamics is beyond the scope of the present essay. Suffice it to say that identification is a largely unconscious process by which the individual internalizes the value-system of the community and in the process evolves a sense of his own identity as a functioning and participating member of the community. The internalization of community values in the Society has to do with values held at large within the Society as a whole and the Church as a larger context, as well as values at the level of the particular community in which the individual lives. The degree of overlap in shared values from community to community within the Society facilitates the process of adapting when moving from place to place, but existential value-system is always unique to the community.

Moreover, the community recognizes an individual as a member when it recognizes the mark of itself in him. Psychologically speaking, becoming a member of a community does not take place when the individual's name is added to the list of community members. Becoming a member can often be a rather drawn-out process in which the individual gradually assimilates the values of the community and the community gradually comes to recognize in him

the pattern of its own value-orientation. The process takes time, more for some than for others. Some individuals may never become members of the community in this sense. The new participant in community life gains a sense of evolving membership as he comes to be regarded by other community members as a functional part of their shared life and experience. His recognition as member by others is complemented by his own growing sense of sharing in community values, goals, and attitudes—his own sense of identification with the community and with the other persons who compose it.

The shared sense of identity as members of the community is the psychological substructure on which the sense of community is raised. This is a truism in any real community structure; it is more than applicable in the Society. One can go further and say that the sense of community is a vital aspect of the inner life of every Jesuit. If an individual cannot achieve a sense of shared values, meanings and activity, he must preserve some sense of participation in the larger structure of the Society or the psychological forces at work to preserve the integrity of the community will inexorably drive him out of the organization. The sense of shared values and purposes is so central to the notion of the religious vocation that perseverance in the face of their absence becomes difficult. From the point of view of the individual, the failure to develop a sense of community has fairly dire implications. Human beings require a sense of purposefulness and meaning in their lives without which they become prey to frustration, ambivalence about their life situation, depression, diminished self-esteem, and a sense of unfulfillment. If an individual is caught up in the life of a community without a sense of sharing in the values and purposes of the community, he is in a psychologically untenable position. The dissonance between inner feelings and outer involvements will resolve itself by either changing the inner feelings or by the individual removing himself from the situation.

I would like to emphasize the more or less implicit and unconscious nature of identification. One does not identify oneself with a group; one becomes identified. Just as one does not identify oneself with one's parents; one becomes identified with them. In identification with the religious community, there are unquestionably conscious processes which enter in and facilitate or hinder the process.

But conscious acknowledgement and acceptance of values and purposes does not yet constitute identification. At the same time, it would be difficult to fathom identification in the face of rejection of values and purposes. They tend more or less to reinforce each other. But one can also acknowledge and accept values and purposes without really becoming identified with the group holding them. They must become internalized; they must become a part of one's own inner structure; they must become one's own before we can speak meaningfully of identification.

The significance of the mechanism of identification, as I see it, is that it establishes a link between the inner psychic life of the individual member and the life of the community which he shares with others. These are not completely independent and unrelated streams. They feed each other, they interact with each other in complex and important ways. This is particularly relevant in the religious life where so much of the personal, non-job-oriented involvement of the individual is caught up in the community interaction. Similar processes are at work in the family involvements of laymen and in this regard the community is a form of substitute for the family. One must be cautious of the family analogy precisely because it has traditionally been so abused. Clearly the family serves other functions than the religious community, but they both share the dimensions of life in a group, and provide the basic matrix for personal interaction, mutual support, intimacy, and the sense of belonging. As someone once said, home is where they can't throw you out when you come back to it.

The important point, however, is that the community through identification becomes relevant to the inner psychic functioning and processes of the individual. It provides the basic matrix for his emotional and personal sharing and communication with others. The individual religious may be able to complement or compensate for the quality of his relations within the community by friendships and involvements outside the community. But they do not provide the context for basic identifications as the community does. To use Turner's distinction, they may serve as interaction groups, but they do not serve as the basic group with which the individual identifies. [See my discussion in *Group Dynamics in the Religious Life*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1965.]

Diversification of roles

One of the functions of the group process in the structure of community is to achieve a diversification in role-functions of the members. In so far as the community is formed and maintained out of the complex interaction of roles, role-functions and role-expectations, the mechanisms which integrate the inner life of the community are constantly at work to bring each individual member into a specific set of roles and functions which more or less characterize his position within the community. Thus the group evolves over time a set of expectations of each member. The member's participation in the group is predicated in terms of these implicit expectations and conversely his own expectations of his role and function in the community tend to mirror these expectations. The group, on the one hand, defines the status of each member, and the member, on the other, responds by fulfilling the demands of that status in the group.

The structure of the community, then, is a major determining factor in the manner in which roles become diversified in the community. A more repressive and organized structure tends to modify the tendency toward diversification in the direction of more narrow range of diversified roles. The more liberal and unstructured form of community organization gives the tendency to diversification greater play and allows a greater range of functional roles to emerge. This set of relationships also reflects more complex factors at work in community life. Role conformity, as a situation in which the diversity of role styles tends to cluster around a central more or less idealized style, reflects a more rigid community structure, authoritarian organization, bureaucratic modes of functioning which operate in terms of the communality of role capabilities and the relative interchangeability of members, and a relative subordination of individual members to the requirements of order. The kind of community structure which reinforces role conformity tends to find itself more congenially realized in larger communities. The mere force of numbers tends to bring about an organization of community elements which emphasizes conformity, ritualization of function and administrative efficiency, while it tends to minimize individuality, initiative and idiosyncrasy.

It should be noted that for the most part the houses of training in the Society have been large. Novices, juniors, philosophers and

theologians are trained in large communities. The economic advantages of this arrangement are obvious, but the impact on many aspects of personality and motivation may be less obvious. It is in this climate that attitudes and fundamental dispositions to authority and obedience are formed. It is to be wondered whether the fundamental models of community life which are proposed and to some extent internalized in the formative communities are relevant to or consistent with the patterns of community life which are evolving outside the houses of study.

If one reflects for a moment on the exigencies of novitiate formation, the engendering of some central core of shared meanings and values seems to be a matter of considerable significance. Members of the Society share with one another a community of values and ideals which is only partially enshrined in the Constitutions and Rules. The shared value system is what uniquely constitutes and characterizes the group. The individuals become members in so far as they internalize those values and become identified with the group. There is, therefore, a need for common indoctrination and a sharing of formative experiences. In a way, the traditional apparatus has been rather successful in achieving these objectives. In another way, it has perpetrated too much of a good thing. It has gone beyond identification and the sharing of values to a reinforcement of conformity and passivity. The times are changing and the forces have been set loose to correct these excesses. But the task for the community remains the delicate one of fostering the basic mechanisms of identification while giving play to the basic forces towards diversification of role within itself. This remains a formative concern certainly, but in a more persistent manner continues to be an ongoing concern in the post-formative years. It is perhaps fair to say that life in community is always formative and that members of communities are always in the way of being formed by their communities. But formation is also most profoundly affected in its initial stages. So that the concerns of the interplay of identification and diversification are at their most poignant at this stage of the game. Large novitiates, therefore, can be seen as reinforcing identification at the cost of diversification—and perhaps rightly.

It may not be altogether out of order to suggest that some greater service to diversification might be made even at the novitiate level. It might be possible that the novitiate program be modified to allow

the full canonical year with the novices together in a single community. Their program might emphasize the ideals of the Society, spiritual formation, instruction in prayer, and other essential indoctrinations. The second year might permit distribution of the novices to the various houses of the Society where they could participate according to their skills in the ongoing work of institutions and individual Jesuits. They could continue in more intensive spiritual direction emphasizing the problems of integrating what they have learned about contemporary life in the Society with the ideals, values, and purposes of their vocations to the Society.

Support

A major function of the religious community is the support that it provides for its members. It is often quite difficult to specify the ways in which the community offers its support. I feel that it is one of the primary derivatives of the basic identification between individual and group which we have already considered. The individual's sense of identification with the group enables him to see the goals and functions of the group as in some sense relevant to himself. By identification the group vicissitudes become personalized. The other side of the identification coin, however, is the sense of alliance of the group with the individual. The group becomes reciprocally identified with its identified members and this reciprocal position creates a sense of involvement and commitment of the group to the individual. The sense of alliance is fundamentally a group phenomenon and obtains as supplemental to the more direct and immediate identifications which arise between individual members.

Support is an effect of community integration on the level of emotional processes which reflect the inner and often unconscious dimensions of the group life [See chapter on "The Group Process" in Meissner, *op. cit.*]. The notion of "support" has some current uses in psychology, particularly in the context of psychotherapy. Supportive therapies are generally those which direct their efforts toward diminishing the patient's anxiety. But the term has much more general application. Support from fellow human beings is an essential aspect of normal human interaction and social participation. It is an ongoing aspect of all manner of community organizations. Support in all of these settings has the function of alleviating

anxiety, enhancing self-esteem, and providing the intangibles of acceptance and a sense of belonging. This is the kind of support that a family offers its members, a corporation offers its workers, a therapeutic community offers its patients, or a religious community offers its members. It involves an affirmation from the community of shared values and beliefs which are held in common by the individual and the group and thereby reaffirms and reinforces the inner values of the individual and lends them the shared security of group conviction. Support in all these cases and more is analogous, expressing itself in a variety of ways and degrees. In each instance, however, the community communicates something basic and essential to the individual without which his participation in the life of the community is difficult and to some extent deprived of meaning.

It is fairly obvious that structure of a community more or less determines the supportive style of the community. Where the community structure tends to be more bureaucratic and authoritarian, support tends to be more formalized and less personalized. The role of the individual in such a structure tends to become ritualized and less idiosyncratic. Similarly the support which the group offers the individual is less in terms of his individuality than in terms of his membership. Where the structure of the community tends to be less bureaucratic and more democratic, support tends to become more informal and certainly more personalized. The community alliance with the individual is much more individual and personal. In very large communities, bureaucratic structure tends to be the rule with a resulting impoverishment of support or with a style of support which does not meet the personal needs of many of its members. Often a subgrouping within the larger community compensates for this deficiency and forms a subcommunity which then offers a more personal and meaningful kind of support. There is no necessary connection between size and bureaucratic organization but there is a more or less general law of organization by which community size and bureaucratic organization tends to be related.

More important is the value system that obtains within the community. The crucial dimension, it seems to me, is the extent to which individual prerogatives, personal dignity, personal responsibility, personal freedom and initiative are valued and are vital parts of the community value system. Where such values are operative in the community, regardless of size, there is a much more explicit

sensitivity to individual needs and anxieties which sets the stage for community response to such personal needs in the form of emotional support. Where community prerogatives, community goals and objectives, submission of the individual to community needs, obedience and conformity are the predominant values, individual needs and anxieties are diminished in the impact that they make on community processes and emotional support becomes more remote.

Jesuit life almost necessarily must find its support within the religious community. The normal layman finds his emotional support in his family. The religious person deliberately declines this source of emotional support. He can find other tangential sources of support, but if he does not find it in the primary locus of his most basic identification something would be psychologically at least out of whack.

Intimacy

The community is also the situation in which Jesuit life obtains its measure of intimacy. Intimacy is a profoundly important psychological notion. Erikson defines it as an individual's "capacity to commit himself to concrete affiliations and partnerships and to develop the ethical strength to abide by such commitments, even though they may call for significant sacrifices and compromises."[2] Intimacy is more specifically interpersonal intimacy which is reflected in warmth, acceptance, friendship, love, mutual trust and dependence (in a healthy sense). Where intimacy is not attained, the result is spelled out in terms of isolation, alienation, personal relations which at best can achieve only a sort of stereotyped and formal quality. They never attain that spontancity, warmth and mutual responsiveness which enriches those who share in them.

Intimacy both requires a developed sense of personal integrity and identity and affects them. One cannot enter into warm and meaningful relations with other human beings unless there is a profound sense of one's own trustworthiness and autonomy. One must carry a sense of one's own integrity as a person in order to engage that sense of self in a truly intimate relationship. If that inner sense of self is not firmly fixed, the closeness of relation to other persons blurs the boundaries which delimit the self and close-

[2] E. H. Erikson, *Childhood and Society*, 2nd edition (New York, 1963), p. 263.

ness can become threatening. Persons who lack the security of inner selfhood sometimes react to the threat of interpersonal contact with a tenseness and anxiety, a reserve of inner commitment which serves to maintain a certain "safe" distance between themselves and the other. Thus the capacity for intimacy is an intrapsychic and developmental quality of the personality. To reach out to the other, to be meaningfully related and involved with the other, is a natural human urge. Closeness and mutuality of human relationships, moreover, is the human way of working one's way to increasing levels of personal maturity. In the closeness of truly intimate relationships one becomes more truly oneself.

In the normal course of things, the relationship within which the problems of intimacy are worked out is that between man and woman as husband and wife. It should be obvious that the question of intimacy is not the same as the question of sexual intimacy. Husband and wife might enjoy the latter freely without ever attaining the former. In the marriage relationship, however, they are complexly related. For the religious the problem of intimacy persists for it is a human problem. But the religious has elected to set aside the opportunity for attaining intimacy in the usual ways. He must seek intimacy elsewhere. He must look to the community as the place and the situation within which his fundamental need and capacity for self-communication may seek fulfillment. The psychological language of intimacy can easily be translated into the language of fraternal love and charity, but I think it loses some of its specificity in translation. Intimacy within the community is by no means an automatic thing. It is refreshing to read the accounts of the relationships of the first companions of Ignatius, simply because one senses the degree of intimacy that they shared with one another.

Intimacy within the community must build on a foundation of prior identification with the group and of members of the group with each other. It relies on a rather significant degree of commitment of members to each other and a degree of mutual involvement and concern. Many religious communities have, as the sociologists say, a primary organization in the sense that the relations within them are of a more or less face-to-face character. The size and structure of communities, however, can minimize the primary group structure and introduce a more secondary style. Unquestionably this is a large area to consider within the scope of this essay since the

problems of achieving intimacy in communities have often deep psychological roots. I would like to make the point though that while intimacy for Jesuit life is not found exclusively in the community, it is found primarily in the community. It is the place where he is able to share with others his inner anxieties, concerns, ambitions, hopes, projects, in a word himself.

Relation to institutions

One of the overriding characteristics of Jesuit community life in this country is its affiliation to institutions. The community is organized around some sort of institutional function. Most typically our institutions are educational, both on the secondary and the college and university level. This circumstance has a profound impact on the structure of community life. Historically the organization of such communities has moved in the direction of large numbers living together in a single faculty residence. The community in our school tends therefore to be large in size and to be dominated by the work interests of the educational institution. The community is organized in highly specific ways as are dictated by task-oriented goals of the community.

The community in this setting tended to be more or less bureaucratic and authoritarian. This was all the more evident where the authority in the religious community was synonymous with the authority in the institution. There had to be a chronic tension between the demands of the group as a religious community and the demands of the community as a group of professional workers in an educational institution. Superiors and subjects were involved in an organizational duality and ambiguity with its resultant tensions and anxieties. The task-oriented and functional demands of the institution had to be brought into some sort of uneasy compromise with the more emotion-oriented and personal demands of the community. The balance of this compromise has been more or less on the side of institutional demands and requirements to which the community was more or less forced to adapt.

Much of this overall structure is changing these days. The institutions are being little by little turned over to lay direction so that the community is becoming increasingly disengaged from the organization of the institution and is achieving a certain autonomy of its own. Increasing attention is being paid to more individual apos-

tolates wherein individual Jesuits or small groups of Jesuits would be able to teach and carry on apostolic work on secular campuses. The momentum for education of graduate students in secular universities has moved us in the direction of permitting small communities of students to be set up in houses and apartments outside the houses of the Society. These changes show every sign of continuing so that we must perceive them not merely as temporary expedients but as more or less perduring features of community life in the Society.

Along with this pattern of change in community size and organization, we must be aware of certain important concomitants. The diversification of community life tends to undercut more authoritarian styles of organization. The particular circumstances of community life are multiplied so that increasing reliance must be placed on individual judgment and responsibility. The cohesive influence of the commitment to an institution and its works is diminishing. It must be reckoned that this gradual process of disengagement from large institutions will have far-reaching effects on the inner life of the Jesuit community which will call for important adaptations all along the line.

Trend to individualism

One of the important offshoots of these developments is the emergence of the importance of the individual. It is perhaps inaccurate to speak of the trends to individualism as an offshoot since the trend is a much more general cultural phenomenon. There is a concern and insistence on individual rights and freedoms which is a quite apparent and powerful force in contemporary society. Its impact stretches from the Supreme Court to the streets. It is not without important influence on the religious community. There was a time when the vow of obedience dictated unquestioning submission to the will of the superior as to the will of God. That dictation is now in question and the view of religious authority and obedience in the face of that questioning is evolving toward a more balanced appraisal in which individual freedom, initiative and responsibility are given important emphasis.

The trend has important implications for the community. The emphasis on the individual tends to place the community and its demands in a somewhat different light. There is a shift from a

context in which the community and its task-oriented goals were a dominating concern, particularly in relation to institutional involvements as we have seen, to a more complex context in which task-orientation is diversified (less institutionally committed) and individual needs and concerns are more prominent. The mode of discourse is shifting from that of question-and-answer to that of dialogue. The tasks are less clearly defined and the cohesive and organizing potential of a unified and clear-cut community goal is lacking.

Increasingly, therefore, the Jesuit community will come to function more in terms of inner emotional orientations and less in terms of external goal-orientations. Whereas the community tasks provided major stimulus to community cohesiveness, that influence is diminishing and the forces of cohesion will have to derive from more basic and less conscious emotional sources. The community will have to become increasingly sensitive to and attentive to its functions as supportive and emotionally sustaining resource for its members. The large scale involvement in institutions puts the emphasis on task-orientation and thereby provides a means by which community cohesion can be attained without more emotional kinds of involvement. Not that the level of emotional involvement is ever absent, but is the highly structured and task-oriented community it can be muted and its importance overlooked. In so far as the task-orientation has become diversified and modified, cohesion must increasingly be accomplished through satisfaction of emotional needs of the members of the community. Otherwise the community ceases to be a community and becomes an aggregate of individuals living together as a matter of convenience.

Thus the trend to individualism, it seems to me, has at least two faces. It involves an increase and an evolution in attitudes toward the individual which increasingly recognizes his individual autonomy, dignity, responsibility, initiative and capacity. The individual, therefore, enjoys the opportunity to exercise that responsibility and initiative in ever broader and more meaningful ways. The gain in this in terms of personal development, maturity and self-realization ought to be considerable. The other side of the coin, however, is that the individual accepts by reason of his religious commitment the responsibility of deeper involvement in the life of his commu-

nity. I am addressing myself specifically to a deeper involvement in the life of the community. I am addressing myself specifically to a deeper involvement in the emotional life of his community. The trend to individualism becomes divisive and destructive if it is not balanced with a commensurate increase in mutuality, mutual support and intimacy.

I would like to add a final word about the matter of community size since the number of persons in a community has become a significant variable recently. The Santa Clara conference made the recommendation that small community groupings be organized for the purposes of providing opportunity for freer and more intimate liturgical functions, increased sensitivity to the personal growth of each member and a more visible sign of poverty. It is my feeling that the small community (a number of such experiments are being organized) carries with it a number of advantages. It intensifies the primary quality of interpersonal relations, it maximizes the personal involvement, it may serve to increase the elements of support and intimacy and it places greater reliance on individuals. The small community of half a dozen men brings individuals into much closer contact. That tends to emphasize the emotional interaction among them and such interaction can be for good or ill. It increases the opportunities for real intimacy and at the same time it increases the opportunities for abrasive interaction. The quality of interaction becomes very much a product of the personalities involved. It must be recognized that there are some very good religious who find themselves at ease in the relative distance which is permitted in a large community but who would become increasingly anxious in the warmer context of interpersonal closeness.

Further, authoritarian organization is practically impossible in a small community. The attempts of other religious groups to maintain such structure in small communities is rather unrealistic, whatever one might feel about it as an ideal. Consequently, the distance between the individual and his effective superior is increased rather than shortened. The individual becomes largely responsible for himself. It is also true, I think, that the community becomes more responsible for him in the sense that the community is much more closely involved in his life and activity. There is a new balance of interaction between individual and his community which obtains in virtue of something other than a structure of relations between sub-

ject and superior. The pattern of relations between subject and community become much more vital and much more meaningful.

Another important and practical aspect of the diversifieation of community size and style is the impact on the community at large. What social meaning does such a variety of smaller communities acquire for the surrounding lay community? How will people perceive a small group of religious men living together, particularly when the tendency is also operative to restrict the wearing of distinctive garb? In the dissolution of institutional communities and the gradual loosening of ties to educational institutions, what effect will be felt on religious vocations?

I hasten to add that I have no good way of knowing how the experiments in small community living are going to work out. I suspect that the outcomes will be rather variable and will assume some proportion to the personal characteristics of participants and their respective dedication to the principle of small groups and their concomitants. The point that I wish to urge at the moment is that a variety of influences are at work in the contemporary scene which radically alter not merely the size and location of Jesuit communities. The changes are considerably more radical than that. They ultimately touch very fundamental issues of community life, community structure, the sense of identification with and involvement in the Society, the structure of authority, the attitudes toward and meaning of obedience, increasing personal responsibility and autonomy, even the issue of religious poverty. It should be obvious that increasing personal responsibility creates a situation in which individuals are much more in control of the management of personal finances. This must raise or at least intensify certain questions about the vows of poverty. The small community circumvents the appearance of affluence created by large and impressive community structures but it also diminishes the degree of dependence in poverty.

My only observation is that in undertaking such experiments in community we must both be aware of the implications and consequences of such attempts and be ready and willing to modify traditional concepts and structures to meet the exigencies created by these experiments. Without that willingness to adapt, we are either condemning the experiments to failure before the event or we are asking for new tensions and anxieties which may pose a new threat to the heart of the Jesuit vocation.

A REPORT ON THE PROBLEM OF THE DISAFFECTION OF YOUNG JESUITS FOR OUR CURRENT EDUCATIONAL APOSTOLATE

The JEA Coordinating Committee Meeting in Washington on April 15-16, 1967, passed the following resolution:

It was moved, seconded and passed unanimously that Fr. Montague, Chairman of the Commission on Houses of Study, promptly appoint a Committee to work on the problem of effectively presenting to young Jesuits the values of our institutional apostolate in education.

In acting on this motion, Fr. Klubertanz, Chairman of the Committee on the Regional Order of Studies, was asked to allow the seven members of this committee to serve as an *ad hoc* committee to discuss and suggest proposals on this problem of our younger Jesuits and the educational apostolate.

The reasons for appointing this group:

1) The seven members of this Committee were selected by all the members of the Commission on Houses of Study, and so should adequately represent the entire Commission.
2) The composition of this Committee was sufficiently heterogeneous: two men from the schools of theology, two men from the schools of philosophy, two men from the juniorates, plus the chairman. Further investigation could well be done by a committee with members from the other Commissions.
3) This Committee from widely scattered institutions was already scheduled to meet at North Aurora on June 23-24. This would obviate the expense and difficulties in forming still another committee at this time.

This topic was also discussed with the elected scholastic representatives at the Santa Clara Conference on the Total Development of the Jesuit Priest. These discussions are summarized in the following pages under three headings:

I Location of the Problem.
II Reasons for this Disaffection.
III Proposals and Suggestions.

I **LOCATION OF THE PROBLEM.** The report on this part of the discussion can be brief; the Minutes of the JEA Coordinating Committee for April 15-16, 1967, pages 12-13, and Fr. Reinert's preliminary and confidential paper included in the same set of Minutes, pages 29-32, present the general lines of the problem and were generally corroborated in the discussion of this committee.

However, it was felt that the problem is not as acute as it was even one or two years ago; or at least, it has shifted ground somewhat. Where earlier there seemed to be a rising dissatisfaction with the whole academic apostolate, it now seems that the disaffection is directed more at our own schools, not with education as a whole. Even here, some felt that there was a selective opposition to some of our schools, not with all. There is a real concern and desire for higher studies on the part of the vast majority of the scholastics; most of these scholastics see themselves working in and through various educational agencies and institutions.

II **REASONS FOR THIS DISAFFECTION.** Again, many of the reasons brought out in the Minutes of the JEA Coordinating Committee, referred to above, were reiterated in the discussion. Some were given a new emphasis, and this leads us to mention these explicitly.

A. The scholastics feel that the Society in America has a deep and unquestionable commitment to certain immobile and fixed structures. This conflicts with the scholastics' desire for mobility and flexibility in a world and in a church in process. We are overcommitted in the number of our schools in such a way that these giant monsters eat up the individual Jesuits. With our limited resources of money and man-power, most of these schools can never rise above mediocrity. For a young Jesuit to commit himself to these is a commitment to mediocrity on the institutional as well as the individual level. This attitude has been lessened recently with the talk of giving up the actual ownership of our colleges and universities.

B. The intellectual apostolate seems so long range and so far in the future that it is never seen as an ultimate good. The actuality of immediate work in the social apostolates during the course from the novitiate on allows the men to experience values that leave our educational apostolates more remote.

C. The scholastics tend to feel that intellectual grounds and factors do not ultimately make that much of a difference. The most pressing problems in the world and for the church are not ultimately ideological problems that demand intellectual solutions, e.g., peace, poverty, racial injustice, the division of the churches, etc.

D. The increasing contact of the Jesuit scholastics with the lay-students on Jesuit campuses tends to disillusion our young men about the effectiveness of Jesuit education. The scholastics meet a constant negative barrage from our lay students about our schools and they talk with many of our lay students who have lost or are losing their faith. Specifically Catholic education does not seem too efficacious in making these laymen and laywomen dedicated apostles.

E. The scholastics meet and talk with lay students who are not impressed by the image of the Jesuit priest on our college campuses. The few priests who are obviously concerned about the students, both outside and inside the classrooms, are the exceptions. The majority live in a separated faculty building, do their work in the privacy of their own living rooms, teach their classes and then disappear again. The scholastics hear this from the lay students and also observe the almost negligible impact of the majority of Jesuit priests on the students in our universities.

F. Still a further factor that increases this disaffection of our scholastics with our educational apostolate is what they see to be the rapid secularization of our colleges and universities. It is not that the scholastics would necessarily oppose this, but it then becomes difficult for them to see any ultimate distinction between a Jesuit or Catholic university and a secular university, and consequently any ultimate reason why they would prefer a Jesuit or Catholic university as the locus of their own future apostolates.

G. With the division of the Jesuit community from the university (and this split is foreseen as possible for the Jesuit community and the high school as well), there is a tendency to stress the efficacy of the apostolate of the individual. The Jesuit educator of the future will be accepted or rejected by a school on his individual merits or deficiencies—not on his identification with some corporate group, i.e., just because he is a Jesuit. If a Jesuit can be accepted or rejected by a Jesuit school, the scholastic and young priest see no reason why they should not also be in the position of choosing or rejecting the Jesuit school along with sought-out

opportunities for teaching in non-Jesuit and non-Catholic institutions. The Jesuits who are most admired by the scholastics are often free-lancers who do much of their work independently of Jesuit universities.

H. A major and permeating reason for the disaffection of our younger men for our schools—and for our Society—is the denigrating influence on them of older men in the Society. To the scholastic so many of our priests appear to be unhappy, unfulfilled, dissatisfied, unproductive. They seem to be lonely, embittered, frustrated, sour men. Scholastics looking at Fr. X, Y, and Z, don't want to turn out to be like Fr. X, Y, and Z—and yet they feel there is no guarantee that they won't turn out to be pretty much the same. Too many of the older fathers give the impression that they don't like the young scholastics, they don't want them around, they disapprove of their "crazy new notions." They talk as if the scholastics were destroying everything the older Jesuits have lived for. The failure of many older Jesuits to go along with Vatican II, liturgical changes, Bible vigils, concelebrations, changes in religious garb, their open criticism of bishops who do introduce modifications and changes; their open and blistering criticism of scholasticates and the scholasticate superiors who are turning out this new breed of irresponsible scholastics, all have their deleterious effect on younger Jesuits.

I. The scholastics tend to think that the schools don't particularly want or need them. The high schools and colleges show no interest in them at all until they are actually assigned to the institution. Too typical would be the quoted remark of an official in one of our schools: "We have to plan for our school as if the scholastics and young priests did not exist; we can never be sure how many, if any, will be assigned to us on the next status. So we plan as if we would get no one."

III **PROPOSALS AND SUGGESTIONS.** The group did not have sufficient opportunity to reflect on and discuss the possible solutions to this problem of the disaffection of our scholastics toward the educational apostolate. Consequently, the actual proposals and suggestions mentioned here were limited; further considerations might add or modify the items listed here. Rather than expand these recommendations—almost all of which call for further discussion—I shall be content to list them under certain general rubrics to which they seem more pertinent.

A. Santa Clara Conference on the Total Development of the Jesuit Priest. It was hoped that this conference would take a stand on the question of our educational apostolates, not only regarding scholastics, but also for priests. It was thought that, at least implicit in the various background, presentation, and consensus papers, some new and viable ways of confronting and meeting this problem of disaffection might emerge.

B. What provincials might do:

1) The provincials should "shake up our schools." (This is admittedly ambiguous—but I suspect that what is meant here is that the provincials should rouse the schools themselves from their educational slumber and their ordinary ways of doing things that mark them as just another ordinary school in the city. Jesuit schools should be doing things that other schools cannot do and yet that are needed in our time and world.)

2) Close some of our schools in order to tighten up and improve those that remain.

3) Encourage inter-provincial cooperation in practice as well as in theory, so that new outlets will be offered to our men so they will not be forced to work into too narrow educational horizons.

4) Retire from teaching—though not necessarily from all apostolic work—those priests who are clearly unfit for the educational apostolate and therefore find it a continuing source of frustration and embitterment.

5) Instruct the older men about their apostolate toward the younger men in a school, i.e., help them realize that their attitudes definitely affect the younger men and make it more difficult in many cases for them to be the dedicated Jesuit teachers they want to be.

6) Our men should be assigned to a college or high school from their first-year of theology (or at least as soon as possible) and for their regency even from first-year philosophy. This would help our scholastics identify with our schools.

7) Have our men assigned to teach in the areas of their specialization and let them be assured of this well in advance. Cf. Santa Clara Conference.

8) Assign not just one man or another individually to a school (high school or college), but a group of three or four who think along the same line and could as a team effectively

influence the school rather than be absorbed by it.

C. What the JEA might do:

1) Start a survey of opinion—perhaps in the pages of *JEQ*—on this issue, both regarding the depth and seriousness of the problem and possible remedies.

2) Have our scholasticates and the prefects of studies ask our young men for their solutions to this problem.

3) Distribute the results of this meeting and discussion on the causes and possible solutions of the difficulty of scholastic disaffection for the educational apostolate—to president, rectors, principals, ministers, etc.

D. What our schools might do:

1) Have community meetings within the school to discuss how the high school and college can take positive steps to restore or strengthen *group* loyalty to the school—especially as the religious community becomes more separate from the school itself.

2) Have our schools more decisively promote the good (scholarship) of the individual Jesuit rather than ask him equivalently to subordinate his scholarship and future to the institution. Perhaps this is an overstatement, but some of our schools give such an impression, not only to younger scholastics not currently on the faculty, but even to those Jesuits who are already teaching in the institution.

3) Instruct the older men about their apostolate toward the younger men in the Society (both those who are already teaching and those still in their studies)—i.e., their attitudes definitely affect the younger men and make it more difficult for them to be the dedicated Jesuit teachers they want to be.

4) A greater attempt on the part of the presidents and all Jesuits in our colleges and high schools to sell the educational apostolate to younger Jesuits. This is to a large extent a question of information and communication: e.g., what are the plans for the school over the next ten years (and also ask for ideas from our younger men regarding these future plans), etc.

5) Have our schools actually interview our men for possible appointments in the future in the various departments and services of the university and/or high schools.

6) Invite the scholastics, especially the theologians, to become in-

volved in some part-time teaching and counseling in our schools (both colleges and high schools) during their time in the divinity school.

7) Make use of our scholastics in giving group retreats to our students.

8) Take positive—and even extraordinary—steps to make Jesuits who are entering or visiting a school feel welcome and at home there. Many scholastics mention that they are made to feel anything but welcome in the dining rooms and recreation rooms and corridors of our colleges and high schools.

E. What our scholasticates might do:

1) Present this problem of disaffection to the scholastics for an open discussion and pass on their observations and solutions to the provincials *et al.*

2) Invite officials and staff members of our schools to the scholasticates for lectures, informal discussions, etc.

3) Promote apostolic works among our scholastics that are in some way connected with our schools, e.g., giving retreats, teaching, etc.

4) Have the scholasticate professors also teach either concomitantly or full-time for a semester in one or other of our schools.

SCHOOLS, JESUITS, AND DISAFFECTION

Robert D. Coursey, S.J.

a critical look

The *Report on the Problem of the Disaffection of Young Jesuits for our Current Educational Apostolate*[1] offers little new in pointing up institutional shortcomings. Unlike many recent reviews of the topic,[2] it does recommend a wide program of specific actions to counteract disaffection. The *Report*, however, contains a number of serious deficiencies, among them several unexamined presuppositions.

The first and most obvious assumption is that a problem exists. Without providing any empirical evidence, the *Report* only suggests reasons why disaffection *should* exist. This method of attack is reminiscent of several discussions at a recent province workshop where the issue was: Why do the scholastics appreciate the liturgy, while the fathers do not; and why don't the scholastics appreciate prayer, while the fathers do? Much eloquence and emotion could have been saved had a participant consulted the statistics. In response to the question, "How meaningful in your spiritual and religious life currently is the Mass?" 94% of the fathers answered

[1] Washington, D.C.: JEA, 1967.

[2] E. E. Grollmes, S.J., "Jesuit High Schools and the Younger Jesuits," *JEQ*, 29 (1966), 41-8; W. J. O'Malley, S.J., "Staying Alive in High School," *JEQ*, 30 (1967), 41-63; J. W. Sanders, S.J., "The Jesuit University: Vestige of the Past or Vanguard of the Future," *JEQ*, 29 (1967), 149-154; A. M. Greeley, "The Problems of Jesuit Education in the United States," *JEQ*, 29 (1966), 102-120.

"very much so" or "quite a bit," while a somewhat smaller percentage of scholastics (87%) felt as strongly. On the other hand, only 39% of the fathers found meditation "very much," or "quite a bit," meaningful, while 57% of the scholastics found it so.[3] Further, a recent survey of theologians indicated that during regency 89% meditated at least 15 minutes a day, 60% thirty minutes or more.[4] These statistics, contradicting the "well-known facts," should alert future committees to the importance of establishing the problem's existence if the ensuing discussion is not to be mere shadowboxing. Here I am not suggesting the rumors of disaffection are false, merely that the existence of disaffection was not empirically settled and that rumors sometimes deceive.

The second unexamined supposition is that the problem has been properly stated. Two polarities emerge in the literature. The first is exemplified by the resolution of the JEA Coordinating Committee in April, 1967, which appointed a committee "to work on the problem of effectively presenting to young Jesuits the values of our institutional apostolate in education." Underlying this resolution is the JEA's view of the problem, "Young Jesuits are disaffected," and the solution, "Convert scholastics to the present apostolate." The disaffected, however, would view the problem as "Jesuit educational institutions are awry," and the solution, "Reevaluate these institutions." The JEA resolution rests on the assumption that the future apostolate of scholastics should be in our schools. This is precisely the point at issue for the disaffected and the one not resolved by the *Report*. Moreover, this is the point that must be proven and, unfortunately, the one that probably cannot be. It probably cannot be proven because those who will try to prove it are of the institution and, thus, accomplices in the crime. A logician would not accept as valid this *ad hominem* fallacy of rejecting an argument because it is presented by "a member of the establishment." But he would concede that such an approach is entirely convincing to everyone, including young Jesuits.

[3] E. Gerard, S.J., and J. Arnold, S.J., *Survey of American Jesuits* (Vol. I of the *Proceedings of the Conference on the Total Development of the Jesuit Priest*, 1967), Tables 26 & 27, pp. 28-29.

[4] G. R. Sheahan, S.J., "Problems of Formation During Regency," *Presentation Papers* (Vol. II, Part 2 of the *Proceedings of the Conference on the Total Development of the Jesuit Priest*, 1967), 153-201.

No univocal concept

A third unexamined assumption is indicated by treating disaffection as a univocal concept. Disaffection, on the contrary, is a multitude of emotions and cognitions; disaffection towards colleges differs from that towards high schools, which differs from that towards all our present institutions. There is no one problem—and it was a disservice of the *Report* to compound the confusion. "The Jesuit educational institution" is a fiction, and the Jesuit college, the Jesuit high school, and the Jesuit scholastic are each only a category of our black-and-white minds. There are Jesuit universities that do not belong to Jesuits, high schools that are not in debt, and even scholastics who find the rosary very meaningful in their spiritual life (although less than 2%).[5] Even the degree of disaffection is probably marked by a complexity of contributing factors: (1) the dynamism and quality of the school, (2) the knowledge and involvement of the scholastic in that school, and (3) the intellectual orientation of the young Jesuit. Greeley, for example, found in a survey of 35,000 college graduates that criticism of Catholic schools by their students increased among those who had higher marks, among those who viewed themselves as intellectuals, and "among those who went to Jesuit schools"![6]

Furthermore, since disaffection is nowhere defined, it is hardly surprising that the *Report* inadvertently demonstrated that disaffection, in a number of cases, is not disaffection at all. For the *Report*, "disaffection" can be the conclusions implied in present educational policy. For example, Jesuit universities are becoming increasingly secular. Then why not teach in a fully secular university? Professional hiring procedures leave the Jesuit college free to contract a Jesuit or not. Then why cannot the Jesuit himself be free to contract the college of his choice? The university hires laymen when no Jesuit is available. Then why not hire laymen when the Jesuit is not available because he is employed in another university or apostolate? "Disaffection," it seems from the *Report*, can also mean accepting the implications of dwindling Jesuit man-

[5] Gerard and Arnold, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

[6] A. M. Greeley, "The Changing Scene in Catholic Higher Education," in G. Gordon Henderson, S.J., (ed.), *Proceedings of the JEA Workshop on Jesuit Student Personnel Programs and Services* (New York: JEA, 1965), p. 227.

power and the demands for increased diversification of apostolates. Finally, "disaffection" seems to apply to cases where there is a positive evaluation of Jesuit schools coupled with the judgment of equal or greater value elsewhere. Thus, many Jesuits feel the Society cannot afford the luxury of 30 to 100 Jesuits within one institution which serves only a very small percentage of middle-class Catholic students, though this is valuable in itself. Here "disaffection" is nothing else than recognizing that the Ignatian *magis* implies something more should also be tried.

Lastly, the problem loses perspective by not being placed within the wider context of current criticism of all educational institutions, or linked to the widespread debate on the place and value of Catholic schools, or viewed as part of the struggle in American ecclesiastical and secular life between the primacy of the institution and the primacy of the individual.

Some core problems, then, remain unexamined by this *Report.* Does disaffection exist and with what dimensions and complexities? Can and should our educational institutions be preserved as Jesuit and Catholic? Should the individual Jesuit have greater freedom in pursuing his own specialized apostolate?

Attitudes towards our high schools

To date, some of the best evidence of disaffection towards our high schools comes from a survey of theologians. One of the questions asked was, "If you knew that you were to return to the same community after tertianship, how would you feel?" 26% said they would feel discouraged, 11% were indifferent, 35% satisfied, and 28% very pleased.[7] A more direct confrontation with disaffection will be possible when the data is analyzed from the recent Part II of the *Special Study of the High School Apostolate of American Jesuits.*[8] The survey will disclose what the teaching regents think of the quality and results of their high schools, whether they consider the high schools the most effective way to utilize men and resources, and which schools of the province should be phased out. This study could also make clear whether disaffection is a free-floating

[7] Sheahan, *op. cit.*, p. 163.

[8] D. R. Campion, S.J., (New York: Office for Research and Interreligious Affairs, 1967).

cynicism towards education, or a situation-specific response, that is, a response appropriate to perceived value or lack of it.

The reasons conjectured for high school disaffection have been incubating in haustus rooms over the past decade where the problems of the burnt-out father, the uncreative principal, the rule-oriented disciplinarian, and the lethargic institution which devours living men and spews back dry bones have all been masochistically dissected. Administrators and the JEA may rightly think the accusations inaccurate. But what is significant here is that the accusations are believed by men who have actually lived within the belly of the dragon. Some indications of the extent and nature of these beliefs and, therefore, of disaffection are the following allegations:

1. Mediocrity of the schools. The charge is frequently made that our schools are living on past achievements without knowledge, skills, time, money, or equipment for innovation. Whether there is a basis for this charge will be clarified by evaluations such as the one being carried out on the high schools of the New Orleans Province by Columbia Teachers College. Whether priests and regents believe the charge of mediocrity will be established by the forthcoming *Study of the High School Apostolate.* What ex-regents think about the apostolic effectiveness of their school's community is already established: 59% regard it as very good or adequate, 38% as poor.[9]

2. Lack of effective educational aims and their primacy over the economic. Again, among the theologians, only 29% thought that there was enough reflection on, and awareness of, the goals of the school.

3. Lack of professionalism and the proper utilization of talent. 88% of the theologians thought their academic preparation was at least adequate; 40% or 75%—depending upon the region—thought their teaching preparation was at least adequate. Three-quarters regarded the opportunities to improve themselves as teachers were adequate to very good. But in the light of their goals of excellence, 98% felt that increased opportunities to improve teacher competency should be provided. Particularly missed were up-to-date resources and teaching aids.

---

[9] Sheahan, *op. cit.*, p. 163.

4. Need for creative leadership among administrators. Principals who are educational pace-setters were called for by the theologians. "Again and again principals were charged with inefficiency, unapproachability, closed-mindedness, even indifference to the aims of good education."[10]

Communications gap

5. Communication gaps both vertical and horizontal. 61% of the ex-regents thought that communication ranged from adequate to very good between faculty and administration, 59% considered communication adequate to very good between administration and students, 67% felt it adequate to very good between Jesuit and lay faculty, and 78% believed it adequate to very good between faculty and students. In another recent survey the percentage of high school teachers and administrators who felt that their problems were not sufficiently understood by the provincial was larger than any other occupational group within the province.

6. The split Jesuit community of entrenched traditionalists versus transient rebels. 15% of the theologians found relationships within the high school community tense, while another 15% found them unpleasant. 63% of the scholastics occasionally, or more often, dropped a project due to criticism from the community or from fear of such criticism.

7. Time to prepare classes, read, grow humanly, professionally, and religiously. An informal questionnaire in one high school, for example, found the scholastic's average load was 21.8 hours of class per week and the average extra-curricular load—using the smallest estimate given—was 12 hours per week. This is in contrast to a nearby university which requires its professors to teach only six hours per week. Concerning time for religious development, the recent Committee on Prayer in the New York Province found that three out of four respondents said they did not think their workload was much of a problem in regard to prayer.[11]

8. Weak religious and theological programs. At the time of the Fichter report, over two-thirds of the students ranked the interest

---

[10] Sheahan, pp. 186-187.

[11] R. P. Kane, S.J., (ed.), "Committee on Prayer," WOODSTOCK LETTERS, 96 (1967), 93-99.

of the subject matter and the teacher of religion in the lowest or medium category when compared with other classes and teachers.[12] Nor do social and moral values, as measured by this report, seem to improve through the high school years. What cannot be discovered, because of a lack of a comparison group, is whether the high schools at least prevented a significant decline in social and moral attitudes.

9. The need for money probably needs no documentation, but the problem should be viewed in relationship to comparable institutions in order to give it some perspective.

10. Lack of motivation and rewards, lack of appreciation for the fine arts, the low status of high school teachers, the need for shared responsibility among teachers, parents, and students, all at present lack the evidence which would prove them sources of disaffection among young Jesuits.

In addition to these cognitive aspects of disaffection, numerous emotional components can be hypothesized. Considerable frustration is experienced by the young Jesuit because impossible demands are constantly made on him which he feels morally obliged to meet but cannot. The persistent frustration of unfulfilled ideals both for the school and for himself can lead to considerable depression and discouragement. Such frustration may be attributed partly to the situation but partly to his own perfectionistic superego or uncompromising idealism, so unrealistically encouraged during the course of training. Moreover, this perfectionism may foster emotionally consistent but logically *non-sequitur* convictions such as "If our high school is only mediocre, it should not exist." This frustration coupled with the realistic fear of diminishment (no time to advance professionally through reading and study) may thus easily result in abandoning interest in the high school apostolate. If the feelings are strong enough, one can expect a defensive reaction of hostility towards the institution that heedlessly inflicted pain and ruthlessly "used" him. This is disaffection.

While no empirical data is advanced to support the reasons for disaffection,[13] the rebuttals are equally unconvincing even on the

[12] J. H. Fichter, S.J., *Send Us a Boy . . . Get Back a Man* (Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge Center for Social Studies, 1966), pp. 75, 89.

[13] In Sanders, *op. cit.* or Greeley, "Problems." But see A. M. Greeley &

non-empirical plane.[14] The attitude survey of special students towards teaching in a Jesuit college recommended by Sanders remains undone. This only increases the speculation that the results would range from indifference to despair.

Attitudes towards our colleges and universities

The number one charge seems to be that of mediocrity: the average quality of students and programs, inability to compete for the best professors due to finances, weakness in theology, lack of impact on the student's religious life, and so forth.

The second general indictment includes a program of action as well: phase over or out. It is based on the belief that a Jesuit university in post-Vatican, post-ghetto American Christianity is anachronistic. With fewer vocations, the colleges can no longer be staffed anyway. Concentrating too heavily on a single apostolate, the Society has lost its flexibility. The weary debate about Jesuits teaching on secular campuses drones on.

These alleged reasons for the alleged disaffection are challengeable, especially since global statements about Jesuit colleges simply cannot be made. While this escape is convincing, the suggested excuse of a communications gap between the college and scholastics is not. Young Jesuits take courses on a large number of Jesuit campuses such as St. Louis, Fordham, Spring Hill, and Loyola of L. A.

Whole congeries of emotional reactions are evoked when the special student faces the prospects of teaching in a Jesuit college. First, a loss of self-esteem follows from the feeling of being consigned to academic obscurity and a college without prestige. Secondly, there is a loss of support from highly specialized colleagues who spur the student to productivity. This may be joined by a fear that, without this support, the newly-discovered and appreciated productivity will end. Thirdly, a general let-down can accompany the return from the frontiers of knowledge and research to the rudimentary level of teaching general courses to undergraduates.

P. H. Rossi, *The Education of Catholic Americans* (Chicago: Aldine, 1966); and M. M. Patillo, Jr., & D. M. Mackenzie, *Church-Sponsored Higher Education* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1966).

[14] J. P. Leary, S.J., "All Vestige, No Vanguard: A Rejoinder," *JEQ*, 30 (1967), 3-7; P. C. Reinert, S.J., "In Response to Father Greeley," *JEQ*, 29 (1966), 121-129.

Isolation from critical fellow specialists and the lack of research facilities and time generate problems comparable to the depression of elderly persons who must face the future of an impoverished and restricted life. Fourthly, the special student might well feel guilty over having to abandon a life of research—the one goal and standard by which he is taught to live and by which his peers judge him. Even more traitorous in the eyes of his professors is the likelihood of becoming an administrator if he is successful at teaching. Finally, a sense of constriction and loss of freedom is often felt by the student who faces a return to the paternalistic and over-structured atmosphere of school and community.

If one wishes only to debate the objectivity of the perceptions which evoke these emotional problems, then he has misunderstood a whole dimension of disaffection.

Extra-institutional apostolates

The group of professional men outside of education seems to be growing. One of the larger subgroups which we empirically know little about are those who plan to work in the social apostolate. The schools are generally not attractive to this group because the schools do not appear sufficiently concerned and effective in social problems. And, indeed, the facts seem to suggest this. Only one third of the high school principals are clearly convinced that we are being very effective in producing social awareness through our religion courses and social studies (which reach only the average or poorer student in almost two-thirds of our schools).[15] The Fichter study discovered only slight improvement in racial attitudes and a slight deterioration in most other social attitudes measured.

Whether the schools will improve fast enough to attract those dedicated to the social apostolate is problematic. Perhaps the amount of institutional lag will be measurable by the response to Fr. Arrupe's recent letter. At any event, it is a rare school in which the social apostolate assumes the proportions of the football team, much less that of the speech club. Will the school be willing to put its resources behind involvement in the inner city, possibly compromising its "standards" and its revenues? Will it dedicate even a

[15] T. V. Purcell, S.J., "Administrators Look at the High School Social Apostolate," *JEQ*, 29 (1966), 59-73.

single full-time staff member to programming and coordinating student involvement in social work? If not, the social apostles will go elsewhere, disaffected but happy.

Like the patterns of disaffection mentioned above, an emotional component exists here, too. Institutional inertia, i.e., the inability to adjust quickly and accurately to new needs, breeds frustration, as does paternalistic and restricting structures. Corrresponding to this negative valence is the positive attraction of the poor and dispossessed. No doubt a touch of romanticism often exists in regard to the poor, but it is an eminently Christian romanticism. In a similar vein is the scholastic's "need for nurturance," the need to serve, to comfort, to help the helpless. The training of the past did not allow much expression of this Christian instinct. Finally, many feel a need to escape the overly-ideational, intellectualistic atmosphere that marked the course of studies, at least in the past, and to deal with humans on a human level.

No paper such as this should be concluded without some reflection on the values of disaffection. Disaffection should encourage our educational institutions to sell their product to the hardest of all customers—to the young Jesuits whom the institutions helped develop. This means they will have to provide an outstanding product, an apostolically and educationally excellent school with humane teaching conditions. Sociologists tell us that revolutions take place when progress is occurring, only not as rapidly as people's expectations. It must be admitted that our educational institutions are progressing. But are they as rapidly as the young Jesuit's expectations? Through disaffection the young Jesuit in his own way has delivered to our educational institutions the mandate formerly used only by themselves: Improve or quit the school.

THEOLOGY AND LITERATURE: SELECTED READINGS CONCERNING METHODOLOGY

(Listing prepared and commented upon by Patrick Samway, S.J., a deacon at Woodstock College.)

Within the last twenty years, writers and literary critics have begun to investigate more carefully the problems connected with theology and literature. As an interdisciplinary field, theology and literature is approached by men of different backgrounds. Some, like Nathan A. Scott and William F. Lynch, S.J., are ministers and priests who teach literature as a profession and others, like Cleanth Brooks and J. Hillis Miller, are critics interested in the theological dimensions of literature. Each of these critics approaches theology and literature according to the style of his training and according to the authors he considers valuable. It became clear at the First Theology and Literature Conference held at Emory University in October, 1967 that the various critics presented their ideas almost independently of each other. Instead of a deepening penetration into the basic problems associated with theology and literature, there was a horizontal array of papers and critiques which widened the scope of the two separate disciplines rather than bringing them together into some coherent pattern. Most of all, what was lacking was an attempt at some type of epistemology into theology and literature as a valuable form of knowledge.

Books which attempt to discuss methodology in this field must be careful to respect the autonomy of both theology and literature. It would be the grossest error to maintain that literature can be ultimately defined as theology or that the components of theology are really the same as the components of literature. It is necessary to limit the scope of the analysis and seek a formulation of the most significant questions. If the right questions are asked (and this is no mean trick), then, one can

explore the possible solutions to these problems. In the field of literature, unlike the other academic disciplines of history, sociology, philosophy, or the sciences, critics have generally shied away from trying to formulate methodologies. Literary critics feel to a great extent that if one comes to a text with predetermined categories, it would be impossible for the text to speak for itself according to its own inherent vocabulary and forms. Works of art, unlike paintings-by-number, have a spontaneity and originality which resist analysis by an apriori listing of color, shape, or texture. The following pages will briefly look at the methodologies presented by five of the leading theology and literature critics.

TeSelle

In her book, *Literature and the Christian Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966), Mrs. Sallie TeSelle discusses the two coordinates of literature and the Christian life with perception and skill. She rightly notes that Christians are often uneasy about art in much the same way as artists and critics are suspicious of Christianity. But this suspicion does not prohibit an investigation by her into the significant relationships between literature and the Christian life for our contemporary world: "Granted the chasm that separates them—the absoluteness and exclusiveness of their truth claims—there are nevertheless bridges that span the divide" (pp. 2-3). Mrs. TeSelle states in her introduction that she will discuss the nature and function of literature, the nature of the Christian life, and show the relevance of literature to the Christian life. As a committed critic, she opts for the position of a Christian, "one redeemed by the love of God," who seeks to understand how literature can be appreciated by today's Christian.

The major criterion by which Mrs. TeSelle assesses a work of literature is "precisely the degree to which it does 'violence to neither faith nor art.' This criterion is simple enough: it merely says that whatever may be the relationship between Christian faith and the arts, there can be no relation that sacrifices the integrity of either" (p. 8). She reprehends critics like Nathan Scott and Amos Wilder who, in her opinion, have art serve as the negative pole in the *condition humaine*, where all too often Christianity is understood either as a type of general metaphysics or as a leaven. Neither the full dimensions of the artistic enterprise nor the specificity of the Christian faith is taken seriously.

In *Literature and the Christian Life*, the religiously oriented critics are divided into three groups under the headings of religious amiability, Christian discrimination, and Christian aesthetics. Briefly, religious amiability means that Christianity is the answer to the search for ultimate meaning; Christian discrimination means that Christianity is a structure

of beliefs either as a set of doctrines or as a morality; and Christian aesthetics means that Christianity is the Incarnation. "The first area", she states, "speaks to the problem of doubt; the second concentrates on one doctrine or a narrow moralism; the third exalts the incarnation. I do not think any of these is the heart of the Christian faith" (p. 58). To various degrees, Mrs. TeSelle criticizes the writings of Nicholas Berdyaev, Roland Frye, William Lynch, and Nathan Scott and praises the writings of George Steiner, Erich Heller, and Erich Auerbach. Her main complaint against many theologian-critics is that their criticism tends to be primarily theological and not literary. In contrast, her particular body of Christian prejudices center around a dramatic concept of man:

> The basic intuition here is that man is a finite, temporal being, who is set in a real world and whose task it is to understand this world through his insight and make something of himself through his decisions. The main point is that man and his world have a given structure, a structure best suggested by such words as temporal, finite, open, free, and dramatic. The conviction is stated in terms of the form, not the content of reality, for the very reason that from the Christian perspective the unique thing about man in contrast to the natural world is not his given nature but his ability to become something, yet to become something only by taking one step after another . . . It is a vision that sees life as inexorably dramatic, with all the ambiguities, complexities, reversals, and doubts of the dramatic genre (p. 62).

In this way, Mrs. TeSelle fuses many of the ideas concerning theology, literature, and the Christian life as found in the writings of Lynch, Brooks, and Auerbach.

Four main topics

This book treats four main topics: religion and the arts; the nature and function of literature, especially the novel; the Christian life; and the relationship between literature and the Christian life. She places particular emphasis on the aesthetic experience and the aesthetic object in order to clarify her ideas. Basically the asethetic experience is the "willingness to be really open to the uniqueness and newness of something, even if it means tearing up the neat cartography of one's world" (p. 74). Two examples of this type of experience can be seen in Buber's I-Thou relationship where one is able to bracket his preconceptions and let the other come to him in a new splash of knowledge and secondly, in the absorption of a good novel whereby careful attention is rewarded by an immediate and palpable apprehension of the particularity of this book.

The aesthetic object or art object has the capacity to concentrate attention on itself and on its unique insights:

> Whereas other objects (ideas, emotions, natural objects, human faces, and so forth) are bound into a nexus of memories and relations, the art object encourages us, though it cannot force us, to look at *it* and, for the time being, at nothing else. It is a world in itself, a complete structural whole, which attracts the wandering eye and mind into intense concentration and through this concentration into an understanding of the novelty and freshness of its immanent meanings (p. 79).

When a person reads a novel, the novel may influence him to act in a certain manner because he is a unique person who unites different modes of perception within himself and applies these insights to his behavior. Usually this translation of intellectual perception into existential action is not systematic, but vital. Such an approach is reminiscent of T. S. Eliot's remark in his essay "Religion and Literature" where he maintains that the common ground between religion and fiction is behavior. Eliot believes our "religion imposes our ethics, our judgment and criticism of ourselves, and our behaviour towards our fellow men. The fiction that we read affects our behaviour towards our fellow men, affects our patterns of ourselves." According to Eliot, we may consciously read literature for different purposes, such as entertainment or aesthetic enjoyment, but our reading affects us as entire human beings and has an impact on our moral and religious existence. Mrs. TeSelle sympathizes with this orientation.

The natural direction of such an orientation is to unite the novel with the reader. With such a unity, one could well ask: does a work of art have an ontological status which evokes the reader to go beyond the mere story? And if there is an invitation to the "beyond," how is this related to the spiritual and psychological make-up of man? Mrs. TeSelle believes that if literature is appreciated as something more than therapy or pleasure, then it must be relevant to some type of reality beyond itself. With Wimsatt and Brooks, she realizes that any discussion of the "beyond" character of literature presupposes some notion of the ultimate nature of reality. She states that at "this point there is no possibility of avoiding metaphysics or what we have called earlier a body of prejudices and convictions about the way things are" (p. 90). Whether one's doctrine of man is carefully systematized or merely notional, it will be imperative to attempt an articulation of it in any literary discussion.

Mrs. TeSelle holds that literature has a relationship to ordinary reality because it reflects the structure of human experience, especially in terms of limit and possibility, "the possibility only attained by going through the tensions, conflicts, complexities, and irresolutions within the limits of time and concrete decision" (p. 93). Like drama, life is replete with confusion, richness, reversals, and uncertainties. Put as succinctly as

possible, "literature is about man experiencing, so the reality to which the aesthetic object is relevant is the mode or structure of human experience, and the truth of literature is therefore its adequation to the form of limitation and possibility, conflict and resolution, complexity and insight that is intrinsic to human reality" (pp. 93-94). The novelist praises neither God nor man, but the significance of the human in all its depth and diversity.

The main point of Mrs. TeSelle's book is that literature offers the Christian "invaluable acquaintance":

> It gives to the Christian, who is called upon to adhere totally to God in spite of the negative powers that appear to rule the world, an understanding of the depth and breadth of powers that his response must embrace if it is to be realistic . . . Literature also offers to the Christian, who is called upon to love his fellows with a profound and appropriate love, an entree into the crannies of the human heart that a realistic love cannot do without (p. 114).

In her discussion of man, Mrs. TeSelle analyzes man as one who stands before a God who created the world for him. Man is basically a disciple of the Lord, one who imitates not the content of Jesus' actions, but the form and style. Man must be willing and determined to be open to God and to others because it is "the task of deepening, of making more realistic, sensitive, and appropriate our response to God and man, that literature's wisdom about man and the world speaks" (p. 134). Following Lynch's suggestions, Mrs. TeSelle sees man as struggling with the finite density of our experience, as working progressively through time, space, and limitations in an endeavor to reach the heights and depths of the human spirit.

A realistic appraisal of man avoids the dangers of angelism and brute animality. Literature displays man's situations according to the complexity in which man finds himself. From his appreciation of literature, man can see and reflect upon his condition so that the meaning he achieves will inform his whole being. He is able to gain experiential articulate wisdom. Mrs. TeSelle believes that literature is relevant to the Christian insofar as it is good literature and not to the degree that it deals with religious topics:

> Because the Christian is called upon to love man as well as to trust God, and because he must know man in order to love him properly, any and every aspect of the human situation that is portrayed with depth and profundity is relevant to the Christian . . . Thus, the so-called secular novel is as relevant to the Christian as is the religious novel. Theoretically, the relevance should already be obvious in what has been said so far: novels educate our sensibility in the contours of the human spirit for the sake of a more appropriate response of love to our fellows. (p. 175)

Man is able to appropriate this literary knowledge and put it into a "doing" situation. Not that literature is a sermon, or a moral directive, but it entices our imaginations to react creatively and increases our sensitivity to the shifting patterns and complex indeterminacy of man in the world.

Mrs. TeSelle asks, "How is literature relevant to the Christian?" and not "What is the intrinsic relationship between theology and literature?" Her question is more ethical than metaphysical. Unlike Karl Rahner, S.J., she avoids explaining categories of thought essential to theology and literature which can be used as avenues to explore the relationships between theology and literature. Unless there are operative avenues of communication based on similar modes of existence, critics will continue talking to mirrors. At all costs, one should avoid the creation of new jargon, a new patois which would only add to the confusion. We should use the available language of both disciplines and see where they have common channels of thought. However, Mrs. TeSelle has admirably answered the question she set out to explore and her work will have a major influence in this field.

Another aspect of the problem is that of communication. Theology is a study of God communicating himself to man through word and works. Mrs. TeSelle suggests that the place "at which God impinges principally on the world—the selfhood of man, rather than directly in nature or history—and the way he does it—as the qualifier and goal of human intention and action—is a model for the integration of the human and the divine that is viable to modern man" (p. 224). A theologian's task is to appreciate man's place before God in this world. A writer's task, on the other hand, is to find an expression of his place in the world as explicitly related to God, or working out of a Christian environment and culture, or as indifferent to God, or as explicitly separate from God. A writer, therefore, does not have to be a believer in order to write good literature. This presents a further difficulty in looking at the relationship of theology and literature: can one articulate a methodology of theology and literature when a large number of writers are atheists or indifferent to the divine? Or must theology and literature be concerned only with the religiously-minded writers? If this question is not answered, then, presumably, theology is relevant to a select group of literary works of art.

Panichas and Reilly

In a recent anthology of essays on literature and religion, *Mansions of the Spirit* (New York: Hawthorn Books, 1967), the editor, George A. Panichas notes "the fear is sometimes voiced that the attempt to explore the connections between literature and religion will lead to the

conversion of criticism into theology. Those who express this fear contend that to judge literature according to whether it adequately illustrates religious doctrine, or whether it correctly captures the essential mood of a particular faith, would constitute an abrogation of the functions and the responsibilities of literary criticism" (p. 11). For Panichas, what is needed is a critic "who can discern spiritual sources of art and can communicate religious essences of art which are applicable and complementary to human existence" (p. 13). He warns against literary scholarship which limits itself to categories, criteria, and methodology because it lacks the breadth and acuteness which inhere in a critical sensibility. Like Mrs. TeSelle, Panichas affirms the basic issue in theology and literature is "whether or not a critic is prepared to admit the relevance of religious elements, aesthetically and intellectually, in art and to elucidate these in his interpretations. That literature and religion are not discrete entities, and that there is a living relation between them: these are truths that must be fully affirmed by a critic who in any way believes that criticism is the 'pursuit of the true judgment' " (p. 14). Such a conviction, however, leaves the scope of literature ambiguous. Should one consider all literature or just literature which has religious and theological overtones? The latter position would place the writings of T. S. Eliot, Waugh, Hopkins, and Dante somewhere towards the center with an outer perimeter of lesser religiously oriented writers.

Some writers have been more specific than Panichas in the formulation of their questions. Following the suggestions of Northrop Frye and Ezra Pound, R. J. Reilly in his "God, Man, and Literature" (*Thought* 42 (1967) 561-83), prescinds from the conventual approaches to literature and asks "what is the single most important thing in the world, and does literature have any real and important connection with it?" (p. 563). Reilly says that we can spot the most important thing in the world rather quickly because it has to be connected with God and man. He states that if we postulate both the existence of God and man, then both are related and "everything man does has some relevance to this relationship because the relationship is part of man's identity, as part of what he is. And thus literature, which has from the oldest times been called one of man's highest or noblest activities, must also be relevant to this relationship" (p. 563). As Reilly attempts to find meaningful patterns in the history of literature, both pagan and religious, he is confronted with various problems. Specifically, while trying to construct an hypothesis about the God-man relationship, he formulates two problems: that of the Incarnation which is difficult to assess in concrete language and that of the operations of grace as discernible in literature. However, these problems are not insurmountable and Reilly lists five classifications

of writers according to the degree of contact the writer thought he had with God:

1. The "rapt" writers (Theresa of Avila, Wordsworth, Whitman, Plotinus, Blake, Emerson) who have an awareness of their intimate union with God.
2. The "excited" writers (Donne, Dante, Thoreau, Eliot, Hopkins, de Chardin) who perceive an intimate union with God in a manner less mystical and more intellectual than those in the first group.
3. The "normal" or "humanistic" writers (Chaucer, Spenser, Shakespeare, Dryden, Byron, Browning, Faulkner) who are religious but this is not central to their philosophies.
4. Those writers who have less than normal recognition of the God-man relationship (Homer, Sophocles, Swift, Milton, Pound, Keats, Poe, Joyce, Orwell).
5. The "fervid deniers" of the God-man relationship who have a negative view of theological concerns. Here there are subgroups: (Housman, Twain; Kafka, Melville, Hawthorne, Camus, Salinger, Mailer; Arnold, Conrad; Dreiser, O'Neill, Zola; Hardy, Dickinson, Crane).

If the writer's awareness of his relationship with God is the informing spirit of his literary imagination, then Reilly feels that this norm should be the key towards any classification of his works. For this commentator, such a form of classification is too subjective and could possibly do great injustice to the various writers insofar as each writer's personal vision of life might be suppressed to emphasize his religious orientations.

Hanna

By classifying authors according to the style and mood of their writings, a critic must be careful in maintaining a balance between his own personal taste and the nature of literature itself. If one catalogues religious writers, it presupposes such a genre as religious literature. Thomas L. Hanna, author of *The Thought and Art of Albert Camus* and *The Lyrical Existentialists* and Professor of Philosophy at the University of Florida (Gainesville) begins his recent essay, "A Question: What Does One Mean By 'Religious Literature'?" in *Mansions of the Spirit*, by asking a question which Reilly presupposes: is there literature which is religious? By positing such a category, does one indicate at the same time the categories of nonreligious, unreligious, or antireligious literature? Hanna cautions critics about establishing apriori too many literary categories. Within the religious literature category, however, Hanna sees

three ways of exploring what it could mean: an autonomous structured category, an upper gradation of value, or an objective historical typology. He dismisses the historical typology which subsumes religious symbols and personages: "It is historical because its very use involves pointing away *from* the literary piece itself in its own autonomy and pointing *to* matters of historical documentation" (pp. 75-76). Likewise there are similiar categories which could be established by consulting an IBM programmer. Hanna believes the most "natural of all reflexes is to reduce literature to something else, that is, something of a personal or practical or historical familiarity, and by this reduction one is able to *use* literature for perhaps interesting purposes" (p. 76). Too often literature is accepted because of its religious doctrine, both to the detriment of literature and doctrine.

Hanna bases his aesthetics not on the actualities which literature has structured, but on the possibilities of life:

> The ordering of its [literature's] structural possibilities is different from any one person's life, and it is this difference which is the uniqueness of literature and its interest. It is the recognition of this uniqueness that lies behind the insistence in belle-lettres that literature is autonomous and self-justifying. And, because it is an autonomous artifact of life, it is to be *enjoyed* and not *used* or *reduced.* (p. 76)

In attempting to determine whether a religious literature exists and what it is, Hanna suggests that we should consider this term either as a category of literature or as an "honorific valuation of certain types of literature" (p. 77). This formulation of the problem separates literature horizontally and vertically. Those who hold the vertical view "feel that truly great literature, literature that has fully and triumphantly fulfilled its possibilities of creating an impressive artifact of life, is by the same token a literature which has religious dimensions, which has tapped some religious source simply by virtue of the magnitude and density of its literary fulfillment. This is a viewpoint which somehow espies a direct relation between the ultimate aims of literature and the ultimate apprehension of reality which is called religious" (p. 77). This position, Hanna argues, is only possible with the assumption that the purpose of literature and the achievement of its end are the creation of an artifact of life which incarnates the religious dimensions of life. Many tend to look on the vertical view with scepticism because it is too personal. The vertical conception embraces what might be called the highest values in life, but on further investigation, the rationale for positing this aspect is that if it is good, it must be religious at the same time.

One would expect a religious man to uphold the vertical view, although Hanna is vague about what a religious man is and does. Hanna

believes that it is natural "for the literary amateur to use his literary experience for other and extraliterary purposes; it is also natural for the religious man to hold that the ultimate fulfillment of literature is the literary representation of the ultimate religious dimensions of life as he, the religious man, sees them" (p. 78). The main danger with subscribing to the vertical conception of literature is that one can discuss it only with those who share a similar philosophy or theology. Thus, literature loses its universality. Hanna bases this lack of universality mainly on the assumption (not really proved or provable) that those who hold this view are incapable of apprehending the greatness of the classics outside their culture, such as the humanist culture, or the Buddhist culture:

> But the patent parochialism of this conception of what is religious in literature is not the only reason for its insufficiency as a useful expression. Even though this view is fatally constricted by an implied tyranny of values which insists that *this* kind of literature is truly great and none other, there is yet another consideration to be set forth: namely, that in this attitude there is implied as well an insistence that literature, as an artifact of life, must by its nature move toward conformity with certain modes of life. Such an insistence ignores that a literary piece is not the artifact of an *actual* personal life but is the representation of a *possible* career of life and that, as a projection of possibilities, a literary work creates a unique structure and denouement which stand in clear, autonomous detachment from the modes of actual life against which and beyond which the religious man projects his vision of faith. (p. 79)

Hanna believes that part of the literary enterprise is to unfold the possibilities in an artificial present and not to concern itself with the divine finalization of human actualities in a timeless situation. He also thinks the historical type and the honorific type insufficient.

The presence of the divine

The most acceptable approach is the third possibility which considers literature religious when it exhibits the presence of the divine as *dramatis personae*. Either a work of literature has a divine presence operative within the literary structure or it does not. Examples of this third possibility can be seen in Homer, Eliot or Graham Greene. With this, the search for religious literature is "thus ended: we have found out that there *is* religious literature and *what* it is" (p. 81). Such a discovery, however, will not be without its sceptics, such as the American Protestant who has rethought the traditional theology and arrived at a new set of conclusions and formulations which are sympathetic to Christian humanism, liberalism, and existentialism. Hanna sees a problem with the "anti-Prufrockian littérateurs" who "cannot conceive of the divine as a person" (p. 82). The newer caste of Christians tend to look on God (*Theos*) in

temporal and relational terms rather than in the more substantial scholastic categories. Presumably, Christian theory has changed and transformed itself. If the divine is considered immanent to the structure of life either as love, peace, redemption, grace, etc., these concepts or relational structures incarnate the divine presence in such a way that the divine can be considered as an actual *persona*. Thus, this approach is a legitimate concern of literature and an extension of theology.

As he draws near the conclusion of his essay, Hanna asks if there is anything wrong with the view which accepts literary works as autonomous artifacts representing life and with the view which sees certain literary creations as having their thematic and relational structure incorporating the same immanent theological structure which one sees in life. Naturally, these positions are acceptable. Literature often transposes the presence of wrongdoing, guilt, and judgment into their religious equivalents:

> What we are saying, then, is that it is possible to have an approach to literature which isolates certain categorical types of literature according to immanent themes and structures which display certain aspects of nature and limits of men as they move through a background of the nature and limits of their social and natural world; but this approach to literature—which brings with it specific conceptions of the nature of reality, time, process, and human and natural possibility—is unquestionably a metaphysics of literature. Its claim to be a theology of literature or a literary approach to religion is a claim only and is an assertion within the midst of an internecine dispute within theology that is only tenuous. (p. 84)

Hanna concludes that there is no theology of literature and no specific religious literature other than the one which contains the presence of the divine. He believes in a metaphysics of literature which is proposed by those in favor of articulating the proper structure of literature in a religious manner. Such a metaphysics for him is open to the richness of literature.

Miller

Finally, J. Hillis Miller, Professor of English at Johns Hopkins University and author of *The Disappearance of God* and *Poets of Reality*, is most aware of the problems connected with theology and literature. In his recent essay, "Literature and Religion" (*Relations of Literary Study: Essays on Interdisciplinary Contributions*, New York: Modern Language Association, 1967), Miller notes that the relationships between theology and literature involve methodological problems which can be readily indicated, but not nesessarily solved. He divides the problems into two areas: one set of problems concerns the relation between the critic and the artistic work and the other between the work and the

personal, cultural, or spiritual reality it expresses.

In any work of literature, critics attempt to explore the work in order to find its meaning. A difficulty arises when the reader comes to the novel or poem with his own background and personality and is confronted with the problem whether or not he is imposing his own views and thereby changing the novel:

> The problem arises when a critic, with his own religious convictions, confronts the religious subject matter of a work of literature. Critics have usually chosen one of three characteristic ways of dealing with this problem. Each may lead to its own form of distortion. The critic may tend to assimilate writers to his own religious belief. He may be led to reject writers because they do not agree with his religious views. He may tend to trivialize literature by taking an objective or neutral view towards its religious themes. (p. 112)

No one would deny the critic has his own set of religious beliefs. Many great writers have been committed to religious truths and ideals. Because of this Miller holds "the first responsibility of the critic, it appears, is to abnegate his own views so that he may re-create with objective sympathy the way things seemed to Homer, Shakespeare, or Stevens. Literary study must be pluralist or relativist because its object is so" (p. 112). A critic must have the capacity to adapt to the mentality of the author he is investigating.

Yet a critic might become schizophrenic by denying or totally suspending his beliefs. On the other hand, if the critic "tries to reconcile his religious belief and his love of literature he may be led to say that the works he reads agree with the insights of his faith, though when viewed with different eyes they do not appear to do so" (p. 113). One could press Christian views out of Kafka or Camus to such an extent that they lose their own particularity in their own historical context. Miller cites Maritain, Tate, Amos Wilder, Scott, and Auden as critics who tend to criticize literature as a theological dialogue with the author. A critic must realize that while formal, organized religion is on the decline, literature can never be a substitute. Literature should never become a theology. A further development of this could result in the type of criticism Maurice Blanchot engages in, whereby he fuses his own ideas with those of the author to create a *tertium quid* which often proves difficult to assess. (See Maurice Blanchot, *La Part du feu* [Paris, 1949]; *Lautréamont et Sade* [Paris, 1949]; *L'Espace littéraire* [Paris, 1955]; *Le Livre à venir* [Paris, 1959].)

But if a critic avoids these traps and still wishes to keep his own beliefs intact, he might "take a work of literature seriously enough to put in question the truth of its picture of things, and will have the courage to reject those works which seem to him morally or religiously mistaken"

(pp. 115-16). If, in Eliot's view, an author wrote a work which was not in conformity with the historically authentic tradition, then, this work has what could be called a negative value and, in a sense, is heretical. What this approach does, however, is to offer a limited range of suitable authors and fails to recognize the "heretic" as a mature writer with his own personal vision, different perhaps, but not necessarily less rewarding.

What happens if a critic tries to keep his views out of his criticism? Miller suggests this critic "must efface himself before the experience of literature, seek nothing for himself, give his mind and feelings to understanding of the work at hand and helping others to understand it through his analysis" (p. 117). Literary criticism could become a trivial pastime if purely objective criticism were written: "The student of literature, quite properly wants to know what's in it for him, and a pure historical relativism, to the degree that it answers that there's nothing in it for him, reduces the study of literature to triviality" (p. 120). Thus, a critic must guard himself against reconciling his religious views with those of other authors, or of making the views of others his own, or of failing to take the religious themes of various works seriously enough.

A new set of problems faces the critic when dealing with the external context of a literary work. Words have histories and have been used in myriad situations before. A poem or a novel can be analyzed successfully in relation to other poems or novels by the same author or by different authors:

> Its [a poem's] relations to its surroundings radiate outward like concentric circles from a stone dropped in water, and it may be extremely difficult to give a satisfactory inventory of them. Moreover, this investigation tends to disperse the poem into the multiplicity of its associations until it may become little more than a point of focus for the impersonal ideas, images, and motifs which enter into it. (p. 120)

Another alternative would be to reject the circumstances and look to the poem as a separate entity. In this case, one may be reduced to mere repetition of the poem or to silence.

Meaning of meaninglessness

In a religious literary context, such as an evaluation of Hopkins' poems, should one deal with just the single poem or see it in relationship to Hopkins' other poems, and his letters, notebooks, essays, and other additional writings plus the authors and ideas which influenced him? Miller acknowledges the validity of each approach and suggests that each approach implies a different notion of the way the religious themes are presented. This brings him to the problem of what it means to say that religious meanings are present in literature. A critic could look at

the culturally orientated religious beliefs of an author insofar as the author mirrors his age. Or if one follows some of the approaches used by the structural linguists, the religious element in a poem or novel would be seen as interacting with the other religious themes and words achieving a sort of literary intrinsicism. A critic could end up with Paul Ricoeur's reproach against Claude Lévi-Strauss: "You save meaning, but it is the meaning of meaninglessness, the admirable syntactic arrangement of a discourse which says nothing." If the words do not lead beyond the author, then any religious significance is deprived of its divine dimensions.

Miller has handled the various problems without going to extremes. He has highlighted the difficulties and problems which plague a scholar-critic. He warns against approaching literature from the viewpoint of the draftsman who plots the interrelation of various words or from the viewpoint of the psychiatrist exploring a self-inclosed mind. Miller looks to the writer interacting with the divine as a source of religious significance in literature:

> Only if some supernatural reality can be present in a poem, in a mind, or in the cultural expressions of a community can there be an authentic religious dimension in literature. Only if there is such a thing as the spiritual history of a culture or of a person, a history determined in part at least by God himself as well as by man in his attitude toward God, can religious motifs in literature have a properly religious meaning (p. 125).

For Miller, the critic must face the problems of literature not by denying his religious convictions, but by broadening his knowledge in history, philosophy, theology and the other academic disciplines in order to avoid error. In this way, the critic will achieve a certain balance and perspicacity in elucidating the proper meaning of the work he is treating. A critic should approach the work respecting its integrity and, like a person in love, let the other come to him in all its originality.

The above critics are representative of the methodological material being written in this field. Their approaches range from Reilly's overly schematic view of religious writers to Miller's more balanced view of exploring the various tensions inherent in theology and literature and showing how a well integrated critic is able to deal with complexity without setting up false and unrealistic dichotomies. These books and articles are valuable insofar as they indicate various ways in which theologians and literary critics are able to expand their visions of life to incorporate realms of meaning outside their own particular interests. Hopefully, future scholars will build on the insights and research of these five critics whose vision is not limited by parochial concerns.